THE INDIAN MUSLIMS

A Documentary Record of Muslim Struggle for Independence

(1900—1947)

VOLUME VI

KHILAFAT MOVEMENT (i)

INTRODUCTION

Late in 1918 the war came to an end with the Allies victory. For the world at large it brought peace but for India it created much discontent. Though the promise was fulfilled and the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms were announced, yet it could not meet Indian aspirations. The end of war brought unemployment, economic discontent and scarcity of everything in the market. This was preceded by revolutionary activities in the Punjab which led to the passing of the Rowlatt Act. It was at this stage that the people of India realised that they had been betrayed and deprived of the much talked of slogan of 'increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration.'

The passage of the Rowlatt Bil' was opposed and in every corner of the country meetings were arranged to condemn it. As a result of the British suppressive activities, the Satyagrah movement came into being. In protest against the passing of the Bill, Jinnah resigned from the membership of the Imperial Legislative Council and wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, that a Government which 'passes or sanctions such a law in times of peace forfeits its claim to be called a civilized government.' He also boycotted peace celebrations and in a telegraphic message to the first All-India Khilafat Conference said: 'We cannot rejoice in a peace which means the dismemberment of Turkey and which has brought into our lives all the horrors of despotism.' Anti-Government slogans and posters became the fashion of the day. The tragedy of the Jallianwala Bagh had already excited the people and it now prepared the way for wild demonstrations all over India. Returning his gold medal Mahatma Gandhi wrote to the Viceroy that he retained neither 'respect nor affection' for such a Government which had been so ruthless. 'Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime', said Gandhiji, 'your exoneration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Mr. Montague's dispatch and above all, the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and callous disregard of feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords, have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government and have disabled me from tendering, as I have hitherto whole-heartedly tendered my loyal co-operation.'

While the whole of India was dissatisfied, Indian Muslims were all the more restless, because of the Allies' policy towards Turkey. During the war Indians did not know of the secret alliances Allies had entered among themselves regarding the partition of Turkey. It was a post-war discovery which shocked Muslims and Hindus alike. Sykes-Picot Agreement entered into amongst Russia, France and Britain can be cited as one of the alliances for the division of Turkey. Muslims who had relied on the 'solemn promises'

made to Indians in general and Muslims in particular were annoyed. The leading Indian public men in England and India voiced their concern in a memorial submitted to the Government of England about the future of Constantinople and making it over to some Christian state. The memorial pointed out that such a course, if adopted, was in direct conflict with the vital principle of nationality placed in the forefront of the war aims of the Allies and would cause not only among the Muslims of India but also among the Mussulmans throughout the world grave dissatisfaction. Meetings held all over India passed resolutions to this effect. Under the auspices of the Anjuman-Moid-ul-Islam, Firangi Mahel, Lucknow, a representative meeting of the Mussulmans from all over India was called which emphatically declared that the Sultan of Turkey was the rightful Caliph and that 'Islam never allows the interference of non-Muslims in deciding the question of the Caliphate.' A resolution was moved by Sir Fazalbhoy Currimbhoy which expressed the indignation and dismay of the Mussulmans of India on the contemplated dismemberment of the Turkish Empire by internationalisation of Constantinople and cessation of Thrace to Greece and the giving of mandates to Hedjas, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia etc., to different European powers. Later on six memorials were submitted to the Government of England. But the Allies were adament on their plan. In response to all this the Government of England enquired from the Government of India about the possible reaction of Indian Muslims on the proposed division of Turkey. The Home Government was told that it would be 'nothing less than a political tragedy which if not prevented will have disastrous consequences for the British Empire.' G. E. Wakefield, a very senior member of the Government in a letter to Sir Stuart Fraser, Resident of Hyderabad, very clearly pointed out that 'in spite of the fact that they (Muslim troops) cherish Turkey as the last of their independent Empire and on that account render spiritual allegiance to her Ruler, the Muhammadans of India did not fail us in our hour of need and loyalty, responded to our call to arms and believing in our justice and recognising that Turkey was in German thrall they fought for us against their very Khalifa.' He deplored over the attitude of the Government and also cautioned it with grave consequences if the partition of Turkey was undertaken. The letter continued : 'Their loyalty makes it incumbent upon us to give consideration to their feelings..., and it is our highest policy to do so magnanimously. As far as we know it is not proposed to punish any other enemy state by depriving it of its historical capital city, and of all temporal sovereignty over the people of its own blood and race. If Turkey, our only non-Christian enemy, receives such invidious punishment and is supplanted by a Christian mandatory, the bitterest feelings must arise against us in the breast of every Sunni Muhammadan throughout the world.' There is no dearth of such letters in the records of the Home Department but the Government was stuck to its plan.

The proposal of the Allies to convert mosque of St. Sophia into a church in Constantinople added more anxiety to the Muslims who considered it an interference in their religious institution and quite contrary to what the

British statesmen declared during the war. Not satisfied with the policy of the Allies Hindus and Muslims came close to each other. Joint meetings of the League and the Congress were called and resolutions condemning the British policy towards Turkey passed. Syed Ameer Ali and Shaikh M. H. Kidwai along with other Muslim leaders wrote repeatedly to the *Times*, London, against the dismemberment of Turkey and the latter even submitted a scheme intended to satisfy all the interests but it was of no avail.

In the wake of these development the defunct Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaba, formed about seven years ago to defend the holy places from ruin, was revived and a fresh All-India Khilafat Committee with its branches all over India was started. The first Khilafat Conference met in the last week of December 1919, and recorded its vehement condemnation of the British policy towards Turkey. Sir Dinshaw, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, Mr Hasan Imam, Pt. Motilal Nehru telegraphically sent their messages to the conference. Muslim delegates from all over India participated and resolutions relating to the boycott of peace celebrations and boycott of British goods were passed. This was the first meeting of its kind which so fearlessly condemned the British policy. Gandhiji personally attended the conference and assured the best support of the Hindu community to the Khilafat cause. The conference also resolved to send a delegation to England to acquaint the Government and express the sentiments of the Muslims all over the world. The release of the Ali Brothers after about four years of internment added more strength to these demands. The plan to send a Khilafat delegation to London was temporarily dropped as the leaders first thought to put their demands to the Viceroy. A deputation of the Khilafat leaders, therefore, waited on the Viceroy and requested him to redress the breach of pledges regarding the Ottoman Empire. Failing to get the desired reply, Khilafat delegation proceeded to London. It consisted of Mohammad Ali, Syed Husain, Maulana Sulaiman Nadvi and Mohammad Hayat and was received on March 2, 1920 by Fisher on behalf of the Secretary of State. The delegation explained to Fisher that the question of Khilafat was not only a part of their faith but it was the whole of their faith. Any diminution of the powers of the Khalifa and his territory would mean a danger to the safety of Islam. 'That is why', said the delegation, 'our irreducible minimum is the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*. With less than that the Mussulmans do not think the Khalifa and the Commanders of the Faithful could effectively defend our faith if in any part of the world our religious freedom came to be in jeopardy.' The delegation endeavoured to erase the misconception regarding Khilafat question among the English people and corrected the biased reports in the English press in connection with Turkey. The delegation later called on the Prime Minister, Lloyd George and also explained to him its viewpoint. To the question of the Prime Minister as to why the Indian Mussulmans who did have no political or racial connection with the Turks had come all the way in the Turkish Settlement, the delegation explained that it was the nature and scope of Islam which made it not a Turkish but an Islamic question. 'Islam does not recognise

geographical and racial barriers such as the nationalism of modern Europeans has set up in the way of the free human intercourse and the wide human sympathies. In a word, it is not national but supernational. We do not worship in the shrines of a nationalism that has for its creed 'My country, right or wrong'.... To the Mussulmans of India, the Turk is not only a man, but a brother (and)... he shares with us a common outlook on life and common institutions and laws that materialise that outlook on life and perpetuate the culture of Islam,' the delegation said. The Prime Minister declined to accept the viewpoint of the delegation and replied that his Government was applying the same principle to Turkey as well which it had applied to the other Christian powers. The reply from the Prime Minister could not satisfy the members of the delegation. Being disappointed, Mohammad Ali and other members of the delegation spoke freely all over England and won considerable public opinion in their favour but failed to persuade the British Government. Later the Khilafat delegation returned to India and started the movement more vigorously than ever.

CONTENTS

SECTION 9

THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

1

SUBMITTED TO HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT BY RESPECTABLE PUBLIC MEN OF INDIA AND ENGLAND REGARDING THE TURKISH SETTLEMENT

London, 1 January 1919

1. We, the undersigned Mahommedan subjects of His Majesty the King-Emperor, beg respectfully to represent to His Majesty's Government that we have read with great concern the suggestions recently put forward in the Press from various responsible quarters regarding the future of Constantinople to the effect that it should be taken from its present possessors, in spite of the Ottomans being the most populous single nationality in Constantinople, and be made over to some Christian people or State, or be placed under International control. We therefore feel it our duty to point out, at the earliest opportunity, that such a course if adopted, would be in direct conflict with the vital principle of Nationality placed in the forefront of the war-aims of the Allies and would cause not only among the Moslems of India but also among the Mussulmans throughout the world grave dissatisfaction.

2. In the course of four centuries Constantinople has undergone complete transformation and is now in all essentials a Moslem City. It is honeycombed with Moslem institutions and is covered on all sides with memorials of their faith. Its population is predominantly Turkish by race and Moslem by faith as was recently admitted in the clearest terms in the House of Commons.

3. The solemn declaration of the Prime Minister made only a short time ago that the Turkish nation will retain their sovereignty unimpaired in their home-land, with Constantinople as the capital of their territories, had a reassuring effect on the Mussulman population of India and elsewhere, and we feel certain that any departure from that memorable pronouncement would create the gravest disappointment. The Mussulmans who have shed their blood or helped with their resources in the defence of the Empire are entitled to expect that the principle of national unity and freedom will be maintained in the case of Turkey as in the case of the European peoples. Any other course would give rise to a most painful impression that the high principles and lofty ideals which secured for the Allied cause the adhesion and loyal co-operation of the larger part of the Moslem world were abandoned in the case of Turkey because she is a Moslem State. We feel confident, however, that no racial or religious prejudices will be allowed to impair the trust of the Moslem nations in the good faith of the Allies and that the settlement of this

momentous world problem will be based on the principles of justice and equity, and of national unity and national rule laid down by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States.

4. In Asia, from the Northern borders of Syria proper up to the Ægean and the Black Sea along its Southern littoral as far as the frontiers of Azerbaijan, the population, numbering roughly, 19 to 20 millions, is in some districts exclusively and in others preponderantly Turkish in race and Moslem in faith. In Thrace, also, the conditions are the same, the population is predominantly Turkish. We respectfully submit that the whole of this territory, with Constantinople as its capital, should be left in the hands of the Turkish nation in accordance with the declaration of the Prime Minister. The right of nations, based on nationality, to remain under their own governments and to possess the power of self-determination, proclaimed and insisted upon by the Allies, applies equally to Christians and Moslems. We do not ask for a new status for the Turkish nation; we urge that the Turkish nation should have the same rights as Christian nationalities to hold the territories which they inhabit exclusively, or, where they form the preponderant portion of the population, as they have done heretofore.

5. With regard to the other Provinces of Turkey we desire at present to express no opinion. But we beg respectfully to urge that whatever may be the ultimate settlement of the Armenian question, the rights and interests of the large Mussulman population inhabiting that Province should be safeguarded and that they should be protected from persecution. In racial conflicts among the less advanced communities, as is proved by what is happening at the present moment in Eastern Europe, barbarities are committed on both sides of which advantage is taken by the more vociferous to allege that they are innocent victims of unprovoked persecution. We trust that in dealing with the question of Armenia the large Mussulman population will at least be placed on an equal footing with the non-Moslem population.

Source : Great Britain, The Moslem of India and Turkey—Six Memorials submitted to His Majesty's Government.

2

A MEETING OF THE ANJUMAN MOID-UL-ISLAM, FIRANGI MAHEL, LUCKNOW

26 January 1919

Under the auspices of the *Anjuman Moid-ul-Islam*, Firangi Mahel, Lucknow, a meeting was held under the presidency of Maulana Abdul Bari

on the 26 January 1919 to consider the question of Khaliphate and the safety and integrity of the holy places of Islam under the occupation of the British and Allied troops. The President discussed the various aspects of the question of Khaliphate and impressed upon his audience the necessity of frank and bold exposition of the views of the Muslim community.

The first resolution was moved by Maulvi Inayatullah Saheb :

'That this meeting of the Ulemas of Firangi Mahel while expressing its firm and sincere devotion to Sultan Mohammad VI, emphatically declares that according to the true doctrines of Islam, none but the present Sultan of Turkey is the rightful Calipha and that Islam never allows the interference of non-Muslims in deciding the question of Caliphate. This meeting of the Ulemas fully supports the views expressed by other Muslim meetings on this question.'

The second resolution was moved by Maulana Qutub-ud-din :

'That this meeting of the Ulemas, while declaring that religious tolerance and liberty are the basis of their loyalty and devotion to the King-Emperor and re-affirming their faith in the justice of Government the commandments of the Shariat Islam which emphatically declare that the holy places including Constantinople should remain under the rule of the Calipha. This meeting, therefore, urges upon the British Government to use its influence with the Peace Conference in order that the occupied territory of the Sultan of Turkey should be restored to him. A peace without that can never satisfy the Mussulmans.'

The third resolution was moved from the chair :

'This meeting supports the proposal that a fatwa about the Caliphate and along with it a sketch of the boundary lines of Arabia and other occupied Islamic territories should be prepared and signed by all the Ulemas in India, and after consulting legal authorities, copies of the same be sent to the Secretary of State for India and His Excellency the Viceroy, so that the British Government should have no misunderstanding on this important question.'

The fourth resolution was moved by Maulvi Nasir-ud-din Saheb and supported by Maulvi Sakhawat-ul-lah :

'That this meeting while sincerely desiring to see Arabia thrive and prosper under purely Muslim rule and reaffirming the views expressed by the Muslims about past conduct of Sharif Hussain Pasha, highly appreciates the wise action of the Sharif in disavowing his title and claim to the Caliphate to which he has no right under the commandent of Islam.'

On the proposal of Maulana Mohamed Idris and Maulvi Iradut-ul-lah copies of the resolutions were wired to the Premier and His Excellency the Viceroy.

A very largely attended meeting of the Mahommedans of Bombay was held at Bombay on 18 September 1919, to consider the question of Khaliphate, and preservation of the holy places of Islam. Mr. M. K. Gandhi was present,

Mr. Mian Mahomed Faji Janmad Chhotani presided. The proceedings were conducted in the vernacular.

The President in the course of his speech said that it was a pity that they were still denied the opportunity of realising their expectations. Indian Mahommedans had from the beginning proclaimed far and wide their sentiments regarding the holy places of Islam. They appealed by various means to the Peace Conference not to commit any such blunder in the settlement regarding the Turkish Empire as might lead to wounding the religious susceptibilities of British Mussulmans.

Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy then moved the following resolution :

'That this public meeting has heard with indignation and dismay of the contemplated dismemberment of the Turkish Empire by internationalization of Constantinople and cessation of Thrace to Greece and the giving of mandates of Hijas, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia etc. to different European powers, and enters its most emphatic protest against this intended act of spoliation.'

Maulvi Rafiudin Ahmed seconded the resolution. He hoped that the Peace Conference and the British Government would give their best consideration to this question.

In response to the feelings of the assembly Mr. Gandhi addressed the meeting and whole heartedly joined in the sentiments expressed.

Other resolutions stated (1) that no differential treatments should be accorded to Christian and Muslim peoples and the principle of self-determination should be made applicable to Moslem people also under the suzerainty of the Khaliphate, (2) that Turkey proper with Constantinople as its capital and the lands of Asia Minor and Thrace should be left intact and uninterfered with under the suzerainty of the Sultan whose temporal power over Turkish state should not in any manner be reduced or diminished by any sort of mandate, (3) that this public meeting respectfully approach the responsible Ministers of the Crown with the request that having regard to the intense anxiety felt by the entire Mussulman population of India with regard to the Turkish Empire—an Empire with the stability and permanence of which the future of Khaliphate is intertwined—to satisfactorily settle at an early date the Turkish question and publish the conditions of peace which are intended to be imposed upon Turkey. Another resolution passed drew the attention of the Government to the reports published in the press of the outrages in Asia Minor and urged the institution of an enquiry, punishment of the guilty, and the taking of necessary steps to prevent their recurrence.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1920.

3

ALL INDIA MUSLIM CONFERENCE, LUCKNOW

22 September 1919

About five thousand Moslems from all parts of India attended the All India Moslem Conference at Rifahi-Am, Lucknow, on 22 September 1919. Nearly 400 came from outside the province and about 600 from outstations in the province. The meeting was presided over in its two sittings respectively by Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahel and the Hon'ble Seth Ibrahim Haroon Jafar of Poona. Eight Resolutions were passed. The first resolution referred to the Khaliphate stating that the temporal power of the Khalifa is indispensable for maintaining his spiritual dignity. The second resolution asked for the integrity of the holy places which must remain free from non-Moslem influence. The third resolution demanded that in accordance with the promise made in the Prime Minister's speech of the 5 January 1918 the rich and renowned lands of Thrace and Asia Minor with Constantinople as their capital, having a predominant Moslem population, must remain under the Turkish sovereignty. The fourth resolution demanded the evacuation of Smyrna and Hinterland by Greeks and expressed indignation at the atrocious deeds which are reported to have been committed by Greeks on the Moslem inhabitants. The fifth resolution proposed that copies of the above resolutions be sent to the Viceroy with a request that he should submit them to His Majesty's Government with his recommendations and representation of Moslem sentiments on the Turkish question. The sixth resolution fixed 17 October as an Universal day of prayer in Islamic India for the preservation of the Khalifa's full dignity and for holding a meeting of protest. The seventh resolution adopted the Khaliphate committee of Bombay as a permanent institution and resolved to establish branches thereof in all provinces. The eighth resolution was to the effect that the proceedings should be published in the Press. A letter from Moslem members of the Viceroy's Council was read out by the president expressing full sympathy of the signatories with the objects of the conference. They say that there is hardly a single Mahommedan in India, to whatever sect he may belong, whose heart is not filled with deepest anxiety on account of the threatened dismemberment of the Turkish Empire.

On 3 November the following cable was sent by the All India Moslem League, Lucknow, to the Premier, Secretary of State for India and the Islamic Bureau, London—'The Council of the All-India Moslem League views with alarm and indignation the attitude of the Premier towards the Turkish question as disclosed by his Sheffield speech which foreshadows anti-Turkish and anti-Moslem nature of settlement he seems inclined to favour at the

Peace Conference ignorant of universal Moslem protests made in this behalf and even violating the pledge given by himself on behalf of the British Government, Empire and nation to the Moslem world during the war. The Council deplores that the Prime Minister of England which has the largest number of Mussulmans amongst its subjects should show such deliberate disregard of universal Moslem opinion regarding what is to Mussulmans a religious question. Such an attitude if persisted in, would drive the Moslem subjects of His Majesty to a resolve to abstain from participating in the peace celeberations of the empire. The Council further deems it its duty to His Imperial Majesty to warn British Cabinet that the action such as appear to be contemplated would result in the absolute loss of all Moslem faith in British fairness and justice and consequent inauguration of a widespread agitation which cannot fail to disturb and retard peaceful development and progress of our empire.

Scurce : **The Indian Annual Register, 1920.**

4

THE KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, DELHI

23 November 1919

The All-India Khilafat Conference met at Delhi on 23 November 1919. There was a very influential gathering which met to come to a final decision as to the attitude to be taken towards the British in view of its breach of faith regarding Turkey.

The following resolutions were passed :

1. That this meeting of the representatives of all the Mussulmans of India places on record its profound gratitude to Mr. Gandhi and other Hindu compatriots who have evinced deep interest in the Khilafat question.

2. That in view of the heart-rending events relative to Turkey Khilafat the sacred places and Persia which have been occasioned by the conclusion of peace, this meeting solemnly enjoins upon Indian Muslims scrupulously to refrain from participating in the forthcoming victory celebration and further requests all the Khilafat committees and Indian Muslims to render all possible help to the all India Anti-Peace Celebration Committee of Delhi with Dr. Ansari as its president whose aims and objects are to widely disseminate the reasons for abstention from the victory carnival.

3. That (*a*) in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Mussulmans of India shall progressively withhold all co-operation from the British Government; (*b*) this Conference appoints the following committee to make considered suggestion with a view to give practical effect to the above resolution in the event contemplated and

lay the same for final decision before the next session of this Conference. Committee : The Hon'ble Fazlul Huq, Hazi-qul-Mulk Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abdul Majid Sharar, Hon'ble Mr. Raza Ali, Seth Abdulla Hazrat, Maulana Fazul Hasan, Mr. Kamaluddin Jafri and Mr. Mumtaz Hussain.

4. That in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place the Mussulmans of India are definitely of opinion that to give practical expression to their sense of dissatisfaction a progressive boycott of British goods should be instituted, and in order to give effect to this decision on the event contemplated this Conference, appoints the following committee to make necessary suggestions which shall be placed before the next session of this Conference. Committee : Syed Zahur Ahmad, Seth Abdullah Harmi, Haji Ahmad Khattri, Maulana Sanaullah, Maulana Hasrat Agham Safdar, Mafarul Mulk, Maulana Arif Hasvi, Mouvli Akram Khan, Munirazzaman Tajuddin, Moulvi Sayid Bihari.

5. That as early as possible a deputation on behalf of the Mussulmans of India be sent to England with the consent of H. E. the Viceroy with the object of laying before responsible British Ministers and others the true sentiments of the Mussulmans with regard to the Turkish and Khaliphate questions and further that the deputation if necessary should proceed to the United States of America to further the objects of the deputation.

6. This Conference appoints the following gentlemen to form the deputation : Raja of Mahmudabad, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, Hon'ble Fazlul Huq, Dr. Ansari, Hon'ble Raza Ali, Syed Hussain, Hon'ble Fazli Hussain, Seth Mian Mahomed Chhotani, Abbas Yesji, Hassan Imam, Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, Haji Abdullah Karim, Hon'ble Abdul Qasim, Mirza Ali Mahomed Khan, Moulvi Abdul Majid Sharar, Moulvi Ibrahim Sialkoti, Muniruzzaman, Moulana Abdul Bari, Hon'ble Sharif Bevji, with power to co-operate with other members from among leading Moslems now in England.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1920.

5

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, ENGLAND

London, 3 March 1919

1. Referring to our Memorial of the 1st January, respecting Constantinople, Thrace, and the homeland of the Turkish Nation, we beg to observe that we refrained from expressing our opinion with regard to the other parts of the Turkish Empire, reserving it for a further representation to His

Majesty's Government, as we were not acquainted at the time with the suggestions before the Peace Conference for their ultimate disposition.

2. We now learn from the Press that it is proposed to form them into self-governing States, under the protectorate of one or other of the Allied and Associated Powers. As there is no Mahommedan representative on the Conference to place before it the opinions of His Majesty's Mussulman subjects concerning the vast problems affecting the whole Islamic world which form the subject of consideration by the Conference, we venture to take the only constitutional course left to us for acquainting His Majesty's Government and the Allied and Associated Powers with our views, viz., to submit those views in this Memorial.

3. We welcome the proposal to create self-governing institutions in the occupied Provinces of Turkey and in Armenia, under the guarantee of the League of Nations, but we most strongly deprecate the suggestion to sever them absolutely from the Turkish Empire. Our reasons for this submission are not sentimental; they are founded on grounds of expediency and policy, which we respectfully venture to think deserve the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government and the Allied and Associated Powers. The evidence as to the depth of feeling, not only among the vast Mussulman population of India, but also among the Afghans and the Frontier Tribes—who form the bulk of the Mussulman element in the Indian Army—against the dismemberment of Turkey and in favour of the preservation of her prestige, is accumulating day by day.

4. We hope that, with the disappearance of the two Empires that had hitherto exploited Asiatic unrest and misgovernment to their own advantage with a view to final political or economic absorption the new Peace would assure the pacific development of Western and Middle Asia on durable lines. We have no hesitation in expressing our conviction that Turkey, under a government such as she has now been fortunate enough to obtain, with her prestige among the Mussulmans of the world would be an immense source of strength to England and the Allied Powers who rule over large masses of Moslems. We feel sure that a new era would dawn on Western Asia if His Majesty's Government were pleased to accede to the request of the Turkish Government made, we believe, before the world-war for the loan of the services of a distinguished Anglo-Indian administrator, with a competent staff, to take charge of the civil and revenue administration of Asia Minor.

5. We fear, however, that the complete and absolute severence from the Turkish Empire of the Provinces whose future status is under consideration will give rise to a rankling sense of injustice.

6. In any event, we venture strongly to urge that these proposed new autonomous States should not be withdrawn from the spiritual suzerainty of the Ottoman sovereign as Caliph. Our reasons for making this submission are based firstly on our desire for the peaceful development of Western Asia; and, secondly on the necessity, in our opinion, of an endeavour on the part of

His Majesty's Government to meet—so far as possible—the wishes and legitimate feelings of the Mussulmans, who form fully one-fourth of the population of the Empire.

7. Under the Sunni system of jurisprudence, the investiture of a New Ruler by the Caliph, the Chief Pontiff, regularises his status in the eyes of his people, and makes any rising against him illegal; it gives him a prestige in the Mussulman world, and places him in an unimpugnable position. This was the reason that led the Mussulman sovereigns of India, before the rise of the Shiah Empire, which divided them from the Western Sunnis, to apply and obtain investiture from the Chief Pontiff. In our opinion, therefore, if the Peace Conference were to leave the Ottoman sovereign, or Caliph, with the prestige of conferring on the rulers of these proposed autonomous states on their accession to their respective thrones, the usual investiture, it would not only conciliate Mussulman feeling, but would add to the guarantees of peace and pacific development among the peoples of those countries. To sever them altogether, both secularly and religiously, from the Ottoman State would, in our opinion, lead to constant trouble, and leave behind, as we have already ventured to submit, a legacy of bitterness which we humbly think might easily be avoided.

8. With regard to the suggested creation of a Jewish State in Palestine, we desire to observe that if the Peace Conference were to decide to create that Province into a self-governing state the entire Mussulman world would resent its being placed under any but a Mussulman ruler, whatever other form the Government may take. Not only is Jerusalem intimately associated with the Mussulman religion and Mussulman religious traditions, but in the long course of fourteen centuries the land has become covered with the Memorials of the Mussulman faith. To convert it into a Jewish state, or to place it under a Jewish ruler would be most repugnant to Mussulman feeling, especially as only one-seventh of the population of Palestine is Jewish. History proves that the Jews can live in the closest amity witn their Mussulman fellow-subjects under Moslem rulers and enjoy exceptional privileges not concede to them even now by many European nations.

9. Finally, we venture to appeal once more to His Majesty's Government and the Peace Conference that, in devising the new form of Government for Armenia, the right and interests together with the religious institutions and places of worship of the large Mussulman population inhabiting that Province (who in many districts form the majority) should be safeguarded and that they should be protected from persecution and that they should be placed on an equal footing with the non-Moslem population, in the enjoyment of all civil rights and privileges.

Source : Great Britain, The Moslems of India and Turkey—Six Memorials submitted to His Majesty's Government.

6

JINNAH'S LETTER TO THE VICEROY, LORD CHELMSFORD RESIGNING FROM MEMBERSHIP OF THE IMPERIAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL IN PROTEST AGAINST THE PASSAGE OF ROWLATT BILL

Bombay, 28 March 1919

The passing of the Rowlatt Bill by the Government of India, and the assent given to it by your Excellency as Governor-General against the will of the people, has severely shaken the trust reposed by them in British justice. Further, it has clearly demonstrated the constitution of the Imperial Legislative Council which is a legislature but in name—a machine propelled by a foreign Executive. Neither the unanimous opinion of the non-official Indian members nor the entire public opinion and feeling outside has met with the least respect.

The Government of India and Your Excellency, however, have thought it fit to place on the statute book a measure admittedly obnoxious and decidedly coercive at a time of peace, thereby substituting the executive for the judicial.

Besides, by passing this Bill, Your Excellency's Government have actively negatived every argument they advanced but a year ago when they appealed to India for help at the War Conference and have ruthlessly trampled upon the principles for which Great Britain avowedly fought the war.

The fundamental principles of justice have been uprooted and the constitutional rights of the people have been violated at a time when there is no real danger to the State by an over-fretful and incompetent bureaucracy which is neither responsible to the people nor in touch with real public opinion and their sole plea is that the powers when they are assumed will not be abused.

I, therefore, as a protest against the passing of the Bill and the manner in which it was passed tender my resignation as a member of the Imperial Legislative Council for I feel that under the prevailing conditions I can be of no use to my people in the Council nor consistently with one's self-respect is cooperation possible with a Government that shows such utter disregard for the opinion of the representatives of the people in the Council Chamber, and for the feelings and sentiments of the people outside.

In my opinion, a Government that passes or sanctions such a law in times of peace forfeits its claim to be called a civilised Government and I still hope that the Secretary of State for India, Mr. Montague, will advise His Majesty to signify his disallowance to this Black Act.

Source : The Gujrati (Weekly), 6 April 1919.

7

LETTER FROM MAJOR H.V. BISCOE, POLITICAL AGENT, TONK TO THE ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN RAJPUTANA

Tonk, 8 May 1919

In continuation of my telegram No. 3-S. of to-day's date I have to honour to submit for the information of the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor General a brief report on the present situation of affairs in the Tonk State, and to state my reasons for my confident belief that the movement which is being initiated from Kabul against the British Government will meet with no sympathy or support from His Highness the Nawab.

2. About 3 weeks ago an attempt was made to start an agitation in this State in support of the Punjab movement; some placards were pasted up in the town of Tonk urging Hindus and Mahommedans to unite and the latter to refrain from killing cows, etc., and a few meetings were held. The prime movers were some members of the local Bar, clerks in offices, school teachers etc. His Highness the Nawab, however, gave them short shrift, and after enquiries orders were issued for the expulsion from the State of 4 pleaders, one schoolmaster and a local merchant. Further the salaries of one or two Sahibzadas (whose name is legion) who had to some extent indentified themselves with the movement were reduced. His Highness has also informed Mr. Wareban, the Inspector-General of Police, that he is continuing his personal enquiries into the matter and that instructions regarding other offenders will be issued shortly. It will be seen therefore that His Highness has but recently given practical proof of his loyalty and I feel confident that he will continue to do so.

3. I informed His Highness the Nawab of the situation in Afghanistan this morning, and he gave me, and asked me to convey to the Government of India, the warmest assurances of his own personal loyalty and that of his State. He himself told me what he had done to the recent agitators, and assured me that he would continue that policy. There are very strict orders regarding strangers entering the State, no one being allowed to stay without valid reason for more than 3 days, and His Highness informed me that he would issue instructions that these orders should be strictly enforced. It is I think clear that His Highness is not prepared to tolerate any form of sedition in his State, and I believe that emissaries from Kabul would not meet with any great sympathy than those from the Punjab.

Source: Home Department, Political A, June 1919, Proceedings, 362-76.

8

QUESTION OF THE EFFECT UPON MAHOMMEDAN OPINION IN THIS COUNTRY OF THE FORTHCOMING ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF PEACE IN RELATION TO TURKEY

Meerut, 9 May 1919

From : Mr. A.C. Chatterjee, I.C.S., Chief Secretary to Government, United Provinces.

To : The Hon'ble Sir William Marris, K.C.I.E., I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Political).

I am directed to refer to your Secret letter No. 816 dated the 3 May, 1919 on the subject of the effect upon Mahommedan opinion in this country of the forthcoming announcement of the terms of peace in relation to Turkey.

2. In continuation of His Honour's telegram (P), No. 624-R., dated the 8th May, 1919, I am to state that His Honour has, during the last few weeks, already discussed the subject with the leading Mussulmans in this province. The general expectation amongst Mussulmans is that Turkey will be dismembered. Until the receipt of your letter His Honour had not said anything to his Mussulman interviewers, with regard to the possibility of the Turks being deprived of Constantinople. In his Honour's opinion the interests of the Mussulmans in this province are generally centred on the question of the Khaliphate and the Mussulman control of Holy places, rather than on the question of the deprivation of Turkey of her extensive Empire.

3. With reference to the last sentence in paragraph 5 of your letter I am to say that nothing has been heard in this province with regard to the rumour that Mesopotamia will be settled by Sikhs and Hindus.

The Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion that the interest evinced by the Mussulmans in this province in the question of the internment of Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali has declined very largely of late. His Honour is also inclined to think that the Mussulmans who have identified themselves with the Hindus during the present movement will soon lose their influence. I am to enclose, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter which has been addressed by Sir Harcourt Butler to all Commissioners of Divisions. I am to say that His Honour will remain in the plains for the time being and continue to see people and watch the trend of opinion. The Government of India will be kept informed of any changes or developments in the situation. I am to say that at present the province is quiet.

Source : Government of India, Home Department Political A, Proceedings, June, 1919, No. 362-76.

9

DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM SIR S.M. FRASER, RESIDENT IN HYDERABAD, TO THE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL B.E. HOLLAND, POLITICAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

10 May 1919

On receipt of your telegram, dated the 5th May regarding the critical situation in Afghanistan, I warned the various Hyderabad officers then in Ootacamund, and leaving on the 7th reached Hyderabad on the night of the 8th.

So far no rumour of the Amir having proclaimed *Jihad* seems to have reached the City, though a good deal of interest is being taken in events on the frontier. The next day I had a long interview with the Nizam and explained that I had returned from Ootacamund in order to tell him personally how the situation stood, then outlined to him the course of events in Afghanistan since the murder of the late Amir and explained how, on the information available, this sudden and foolish action of the young Amir, Amanullah Khan, appeared to be a desperate effort to ally the discontent of his people and soldiery by appealing to their fanaticism and cupidity. The Nizam followed it all with much interest, agreed that the Amir's behaviour was insane, and volunteered the opinion that in no circumstances could such a war be regarded as a religious war by any reasonable Mahommedan.

This, I admitted, is of course true, but the danger was that when, or if, copies of the Amir's inflammatory *Firman* reached Hyderabad the ignorant Arabs and other fanatical elements might be moved to some sudden outbreak such as threatened in 1914, and it was necessary to be prepared for any contingency of this kind.

His Exalted Highness concurred and said that he would order the Kotwal secretly to be on the look-out to confiscate any proclamation and to warn the Ulemas that no meetings must be permitted. There was every confidence on my part, I said, in his ability to prevent disorder, now that he was forewarned, and I did not anticipate any attempt at violence on a big scale. We had plenty of British troops in Secunderabad and the mob would probably think twice before running their heads against the Residency where the garrison was at full strength. The more serious risk is that gangs of *badmashes* might give vent to their fanaticism by crossing the river from the City to attach bungalows in the quarter occupied by Christians, and he would see the necessity of preventing even a single such outrage on Europeans as had occurred recently in the Punjab. His Exalted Highness supposed that we would take measures from the Residency to protect Christians, but I pointed out that the responsibility for his own areas lay upon him and that it was not

for the Resident to send British troops into his territory unless he needed their assistance. The best plan, therefore, was for His Exalted Highness to authorise the Kotwal on the first sign of the Civil Police requiring military help to call upon Colonel Sir Afsar-ul-Mulk to post his troops according to the plan drawn up in 1914. The Nizam agreed to do this, and Afsar, I may mention, has been already warned by me of the part he may have to play. His Exalted Highness' attitude throughout was most sensible and friendly, and if, as I anticipate, he gives the necessary firm lead to his people, should occasion arise, there will be no necessity to put into operation the preventive measures which we hold in readiness under our own Defence Scheme. The Afghan situation, it is clear, however, will increase the risk of excitement being caused by the publication of the peace terms with Turkey and I venture to hope that any announcement on the subject will be deferred, if possible, until things are quieter on the frontier.

Source : Home Department, Political A, June 1919, Proceedings, 362-76.

10

EXTRACT FROM URDU LETTER SENT BY SHAUKAT ALI KHADIM-I-KAABA, FROM CHHINDWARA, TO KHALIQ-UZ-ZAMAN, VAKIL, LUCKNOW

10 May 1919

I received the orders for my release yesterday (sic.). I wrote to the Chief Commissioner after the Friday prayers that I would not in future comply with any order which may be sent to me under the Defence of India Act. I read out this letter, and mentioned my demands about Islamic questions embodied in my letter of the 24th April, sent to the Viceroy. I made it clear that the Mahommedans should not render any kind of assistance, unless all Islamic questions were decided in their favour. May God give me power never to swerve from the right path. We are now mischief-mongers. If our advice is accepted, the foundations of the Empire will be strengthened but if not, the Mussulmans have not sat quiet in the past, nor will they sit quiet, nor will they allow others to sit quiet. Yesterday's papers contained an account of the disturbances on the Frontier. All this trouble is due to the treatment of the sacred places and sacred countries. Our advice should be accepted, and our internees should be released, and all these questions should be settled through their intervention. Otherwise no Muslim will render any assistance

in the war either in India or outside India. It will even be obligatory on him to join the Jehad in India. All these facts should be brought to the notice of Government. I have also written to Mr. Gandhi and sent a copy of the letter to the Maulana Saheb. We are joining the Satyagraha movement, but in taking the vow we have added the Islamic words, which we added to the undertaking we gave. Compliance with religious injunctions is the primary duty.

See the letter which Muhammad sent to the Maulana. I will write tomorrow. What will the Government do ? I do not care. It is advisable that we should be released and that all these questions should be settled by our intervention. Show this letter to all my friends.

Source : Government of India, Home Department Political A., Proceedings, July 1919, Nos. 2-32.

11

DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM G. E. WAKEFIELD, ESQ., TO SIR STUART FRASER, RESIDENT AT HYDERABAD

Hyderabad, 12 May 1919

Ever since you told me in confidence a few days ago of the decision of the Peace Conference to destroy the temporal power of Turkey and to install America in Constantinople as a mandatory, my mind has been obsessed with the gravity of the situation and my convictions now constrain me to record my humble opinion which I would ask you to kindly forward to H.E. the Viceroy for consideration. I feel sure that similar represention have already been made by weightier pens than mine but, as you know, practically the whole of my life has been spent in India and I have taken particular pains to acquire intimate knowledge of her peoples, their languages, feelings and aspirations; these facts embolden me to endeavour to help prevent the occurence of what I regard as nothing less than a political tragedy which if not prevented will have disastrous consequences for the British Empire. With full sense of responsibility I say that if all semblance of Turkish independence is deliberately destroyed the feelings of every Sunni Mahommedan subject of the Empire including our Mahommedan troops, will be alienated. In spite of the fact that they cherish Turkey as the last of their independent Empires and on that account render spiritual allegiance to her Ruler, the Mahommedans of India did not fail us in our hour of need and loyally responded to our call to

arms and believing in our justice and recognising that Turkey was in German thrall they fought for us against their very Khalipha.

Their loyalty makes it incumbent upon us to give consideration to their feelings now that victory is ours with this assistance, and it is our highest policy to do so magnanimously. As far as we know it is not proposed to punish any other enemy State by depriving it of its historic capital city and of all temporal sovereignty over the people of its own blood and race and if Turkey, our only non-Christian enemy, receives such invidious punishment and is supplanted by a Christian Mandatory, the bitterest feelings must arise against us in the breast of every Sunni Mahommedan throughout the world.

On the other hand if we are magnanimous in the hour of victory and leave her Constantinople and her purely Turkish Vilayets, imposing adequate safeguards as in the case of Germany; and further, to placate the deeply felt religious scruples of our Mahommedan subjects and in recognition of their loyalty to us during the war, we allow her purely tutular sovereignty over Mecca and Medina, in like manner as Nepal is still permitted by us to pay nominal tribute annually to her ancient suzerain China, we shall undoubtedly secure the heart-felt gratitude, not only of our Mahommedan subjects but also of the whole Sunni Mahommedan world.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362–76.

12

DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, THE EARL OF RONALDSHAY, GOVERNOR OF BENGAL, TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY

Calcutta, 15 May 1919

Many thanks for your letter of May 12th. I came back to Calcutta last week on receipt of Marris's letter of May 3rd in which it was requested that Heads of Local Governments should endeavour to prepare Mahommedan opinion for the publication of the terms to be imposed upon Turkey. I first saw Shams-ul-Huda and told him in confidence all that I knew of the probable nature of the terms. He was very emphatic on the point that the attitude of the Mahommedans here will be profoundly affected by the position occupied by the Sultan of Turkey. What he said in effect amounted to this —

'It is all very well to tell the Mahommedans that the question of the Caliphate will be treated as purely one for their decision; but there is no one except the Sultan of Turkey who at present fulfils the conditions necessary

to the discharge of the functions of Caliph. And if the terms of peace are such that he no longer fulfils the conditions, the Mahommedans will be placed in an impossible position.' I gathered from him that some measures of independent temporal sovereignty was essential in the Caliph, and it was for this reason that I telegraphed to the Home Department for information on this point.

On the 11th I saw ten or twelve representatives of different Mahommedan interests and conferred with them collectively. On the advice of Shams-ul-Huda I did not explain the full extent of the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire indicated in Marris's letter; but contented myself with informing them that there was no chance of Constantinople being retained by Turkey. Shams-ul-Huda was not present at this conference but his view, as expressed to me privately the day before, seemed to be that in the absence of any information as to what the position of the Sultan would be, it would be unwise at first to focus attention upon the full extent of the dismemberment of the Empire which the non-rendition of Constantinople, Mesopotamia, Arabia or Jerusalem appears to foreshadow. When I informed the conference that the British and Indian delegates had done their best to press the Mahommedan point of view upon the Peace Conference and had been successful so far as I knew in securing that the holy places would be entrusted to Muslim management, the point was at once raised as to whose management? Who would control the holy places, and who would appoint the management? I was, of course, unable to inform them as to this. The impression left on my mind as a result of discussion which I have so far had is that they are a little suspicious that while we profess a determination to leave the question of the Caliphate to Mahommedan decision, we are agreeing to terms in the case of Turkey which will place in the hands of the King of the Hedjaz powers which ought to be possessed and exercised by the Caliph.

The conference which I held on the 11th was nominally of a confidential character. But all that took place as it is, needless to say, already pretty widely known. This is, of course, what I anticipated; and I have now summoned a number of leading Mahommedans from different parts of the Presidency to see me here. This had been done by private invitation direct to each, and I shall not see them collectively, but shall grant each a separate private interview.

I have also instructed all District Officers confidentially to see all Mahommedan officials and *Kazis* in their districts and to inform them verbally that the terms to be imposed upon Turkey are likely to be such as to create sorrow and possibly resentment in the minds of Mahommedans; and to impress upon them that it is their duty to do all that lies, in their power, should necessity arise, to allay feelings of excitement among their co-religionists, and to report immediately any indications of agitation. To sum up, the result of the steps which I have so far taken has been to make it pretty generally known in Mahommedan circles in Calcutta (and the news will very shortly filter through to the Mofussil) that the terms to be

imposed upon Turkey will be of a character which will stir deeply the sentiment of Islam as a whole. There is now little more that I can do without further information. Those in conference with me on the 11th were unanimously of opinion that more definite information as to the position of the Sultan was most desirable; and those who advised that the religious leaders of the community in Bengal should be tactfully approached urged me to endeavour to obtain information on this point before I took steps in this direction. The religious leaders are by now, of course, well aware of all that was said at the conference here on the 11th. The Egyptian Imam of the Nakhoda mosque—a constant centre of disturbance in recent times—asked the Commissioner of Police whether he would be entitled to say prayers in the name of the Sultan of Turkey as Caliph. He was informed that since the question of Caliph would be decided by Mahommedans themselves, there would be nothing, so far as we were concerned, to prevent him doing so, on which he expressed satisfaction.

It is rash to prophesy; but I can say that up to the present time there are no indications of disturbance in Bengal. I have been watching all reports from Calcutta itself and from the districts very carefully for some time past; and I have been surprised at the striking absence of agitation to which these all testify. At the same time I have little doubt as to whence attempts to exploit the Mahommedan situation will come, and am keeping a close watch upon a little clique of Mahommedans in Calcutta including Akram Khan, the editor of Moslem newspaper and several others. My present information, however, justifies me in believing that the majority of Mahommedans here will endeavour to avoid raising a serious issue between the community and Government.

Source: Government of India Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362-76.

13

DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM MR. O.V. BOSANQUET, AGENT TO THE GOVENOR GENERAL IN CENTRAL INDIA TO THE LIEUTENENT COLONEL R.E. HOLLAND, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Indore, 14 May 1919

Many thanks for your secret D.O. letter No. 986 of the 10th May, telling me that His Excellency will send a *Kharita* to Her Highness the Begum about the Peace Terms with Turkey.

I sent Grant a further report on the 11th May, at the end of which I alluded to the enclosure of Ogilvie's secret No. 86-I.A.C., of the 7th May. The post takes so long to reach Bhopal from here that I sent the letter to Luard by special messenger. Unfortunately our telegraph service is still worse, express messages between Bhopal and Indore taking 24 hours, with the result that I never got a telegram from him that he was coming over to see me, so he has missed the messenger, but will see Her Highness on 16th. As there is no P.A. now in Malwa, I am sending Waterfield to Jaora to interview the Nawab on the subject.

Luard's news is all good. The Begum's present attitude, from which we hope to dislodge her, is that the Arabs must be under the Turks; but even so she expects no trouble in Bhopal. The Nawab and Hamidullah say the same thing. Luard has, as a precaution, worked out with the latter a security scheme for Bhopal City in the event of any trouble or disturbance. In that connection I may mention that Her Highness is rather nervous about the Imperial Service Cavalry leaving the State, and has said that with no regiment in Sehore, she may have to ask for assistance from us in the event of trouble brewing, as she does not think much of her Imperial Service Infantry, who are very inefficient. If the Cavalry are to go on active service, the whole regiment go; but if they are only wanted for garrison duty in India, it might be as well to leave a squadron behind in Bhopal.

To add to the complications, the Superintendent of the Railway Police informed Luard on the 10th that a strike was apprehended on the G.I.P. about the 16th. That was the first that we had heard of it; and as nothing was said about bringing the military 'Railway Strike Scheme' into force, Luard fixed up with Hamiddullah for the Darbar to furnish guards for the line if required and I telegraphed to Jardine to warn him and to get the Gwalior Darbar to do the same.

Hamidullah has done very well indeed over all the arrangements. General Obidullah Khan was away in Bombay, and Hamidullah took it on himself, on the first news of trouble with Afghanistan, to mobillse the I.S. Troops, and has worked, throughout in a most prompt and business like way, with every wish to help. I am writing to congratulate Her Highness the Begum on his efforts.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362-76.

14

LETTER FROM LIEUTENENT COLONEL A.D.A. G. BANNERMAN, RESIDENT IN KASHMIR, TO THE POLITICAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Srinagar, May 1919

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of letter No. 86-I.A.C., dated the 7 May 1919 from the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign and Political Department.

2. The Mahommedan population of Kashmir appears as yet to evince but little interest in the welfare of Turkey and the consequences which must result from her entry into the war and her subsequent defeat. There is at present no cause for apprehension so far as Kashmiri Moslems are concerned; but the situation will be carefully watched and every effort will be made to sound the feelings of Mahommedans from time to time. Any developments that may occur will be instantly reported to the Government of India.

3. It has been suggested to me that a means of counteracting the influence of agitators like the Ali brothers and/or reassuring the Mussalmans of India might be found in bringing together the present administration of the Hedjaz and the leaders of Haj.

Whether the Sultan of Turkey continues to be regarded as the spiritual head of Islam or not, the actual position of the Sheriff of Mecca is one of undeniable strength. There may be other places outside the Hedjaz which are sacred to Mahommedans but the halo of Islamic veneration centres round Mecca and Medina; and it is the pilgrimage to Mecca which confers on the votary the coveted title of Haji.

As King of the Hedjaz and Warden of the sacred Harems of Mecca and Medina, the Sheriff of Mecca is therefore endowed with an importance and dignity which the Mahommedans of India cannot ignore.

It would then very likely have a good effect if the King of the Hedjaz were induced to inaugurate an Advisory body of Mahommedan from Overseas whose opinion would be consulted with regard to the facilities to be afforded to pilgrims visiting the Hedjas. The general recognition and prestige of the Shariff might thus be enhanced and the revenues from the Haj traffic perhaps be established; while in India the creation of some such Advisory body might provide a valve for the wounded pride of the followers of Islam and might engender an active interest in, and to some extent, a feeling of responsibility for the Hedjaz Administration which would tend to allay the loud-voiced lamentations of political Agitators over the curtailment of the temporal powers of the Sultan of Turkey.

The precise constitution of the representative body suggested would have

to be settled with the King of the Hedjaz from whom the invitation would formally emanate but it has been suggested that one or more representatives might be selected annually by each Province or Native State, or groups of Native States, containing a large Moslem population.

These representatives, or a limited number of them, might be deputed to visit the Capital of the King of Hedjaz and thus get into closer touch with Arab thought.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June, 1919, 362-76.

15

LETTER FROM S.B.A. PATTERSON, COMMISSIONER OF AJMER-MERWARA TO A.D. MACPHERSON, ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN RAJPUTANA AND CHIEF COMMISSIONER, AJMER-MERWARA

Ajmer, 18 May 1919

I have the honour to report for the information of the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner that this morning I met an assembly of some thirty leading Mahommedans of Ajmer representing both the religious and secular sections of the community. I was accompanied by Lieutenant-Colonel Haig, C.B., Civil Surgeon, Sahibzada Abdul Wahid Khan, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mr. Gibson, Assistant Commissioner, and Mr. Higginson, Superintendent of Police. I explained to them the Turkish peace terms and the position they would have to face through the complete dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. I attach a copy of my address. On its conclusion the Sahibzada read out a translation in Urdu and then addressed the meeting himself giving a few words of sound and admirable advice, a copy of which I attach.

2. I was very agreeably impressed by the way the terms were received, and so were my colleagues. When the [meeting broke up we stood about discussing the question with various Mahommedans present. I spoke to several of the leading Maulvis from the *Durgah* whom the Sahibzada had with difficulty persuaded to attend. They, including the Maulvi, assured me that there would be no trouble, that, while deploring the break up of the Turkish Empire, they were fully assured of the future for Islam under the British Crown; that they disapproved the doctrine of Mahomed Ali and were absolutely averse to any form of rebellion or '*hijrat*', and they promised to suppress to the best of their ability any hot-headed young men who might try

to raise excitement. I feel certain their professions were genuine. I did not attempt to obtain in any expression of opinion as to whether India is '*Dar-ul-harb*' or '*Dar-ul-Islam*', I was informed yesterday by the Sahibzada that the late Amir or Afghanistan decided this point a few years ago when visiting the Durgah. His late Majesty ruled out that India is '*Dar-ul-harb*'. In spite of this it stood the test of four years' war against the Sultan of Turkey. In my opinion it would be far sounder to leave this religious question as purely academic one. If it is so left I think that it is very probable that the great majority of Mahommedans will find means to combine enjoyment of the pleasures of this earth with a safe road to the Prophet's paradise to come. '*Hijrat*' has few attractions; rebellion fewer. I do not think there is any use in attempting to secure from the leading Ulemas a declaration to the effect that India is '*Dar-ul-Islam.*' Hannibal's elephants could never be taught the goose-step.

3. I much appreciate the assistance which has been given to me by Sahibzada Abdul Wahid Khan and the excellent influence he is exercising. I bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner.

Sourcc : **Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362–76.**

16

TELEGRAM TO HER HIGHNESS THE BEGUM SAHIBA OF BHOPAL FROM MAULVI ABDUL BARI

Lucknow, 23 May 1919

Please try to use your influence in Government for preservation of sanctity and integrity of holy places and supreme spiritual authority of Caliphate as well as the independence of Muslim countries, these are serious times demanding the utmost constitutional efforts of all and every true Muslim in the cause of their religion.

REPLY TO MAULANA ABDUL BARI

Bhopal, 24 May 1919

Your telegram regarding sanctity and integrity of holy places, etc. I am commanded by Her Highness to inform you that she has already confidentially given her opinion to the Government of India on the subject and the Government, on whom Her Highness has implicit reliance, has very kindly informed

the Darbar that they are always ready to safeguard and preserve the interests of their Muslim subjects and will now as in the past, sympathetically keep in view their religious feelings and susceptibilities. Her Highness as a Muslim Ruler desires to say that she expects all Mussulmans of India to adhere to the doctrines of Islam and keep the peace in the country and be faithful and loyal to the King Emperor. Her Highness has every confidence that all leaders of Islam in India will use their influence to promote peace and loyalty relying fully on the Government of India and the King Emperor.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362-76.

17

TELEGRAM FROM MAULVI ABDUL BARI OF LUCKNOW, TO HIS HIGHNESS THE NAWAB OF RAMPUR STATE, UNITED PROVINCES

23 May 1919

Please try to use your influence in Government for preserving the sanctity and integrity of holy places and supreme spiritual authority of Caliphate as well as the independence of Muslim countries. These are serious times demanding the utmost constitutional efforts of all and every true Muslim in the cause of their religion.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings. June 1919, 362-76.

18

LETTER FROM Mr. M.K. GANDHI TO ALI BROTHERS

Bombay, 23 May 1919

I write with a heavy heart for I see that I disagree with you on three things and my disagreement must pain you, as it has already considerably pained me. I wonder whether Mr. Ghate ever received my letter which was meant for you, and whether if he did, you got it. The letter explains my

position regarding your memorial to the Viceroy. I shall try briefly to explain it as having received no reply from you i fear that you have not seen my letter to Ghate.

I consider that your memorial was too undignified for the great cause you are espousing and of which I have felt you are pre-eminently the embodiment, and for which you have suffered without a murmur all these long years and are still suffering. Your language was inflammatory and too full of declamation for a Memorial. Your statement of the Mahommedan claims instead of representing an irreducible minimum was an exaggeration. I am sure you do not propose to raise questions affecting issues that were rightly or wrongly settled long before the war. You have a right to claim the restoration of the temporal status of Islam as it existed at the time of outbreak of war. I would like you even now to re-draft your memorial. Make a reasoned and logical statement that must arrest and command the attention of the world. The success of any cause naturally and necessarily depends finally upon the will of God. But that will is almost (always ?) conditioned by the manner in which we who approach throne of the Almighty conduct ourselves, and nothing avails there but cold reason sanctified by truth, humility and strictest moderation. In the new memorial I would omit all mention of personal suffering. It stands as a living record speaking for itself, if you adopt my proposal I would love to reverse your draft.

The two other things I have disagreed with you are your two letters sent to the Press for publication. You now know why I stopped the publication of your first letter. The second letter just received had also been stopped for the same reasons but the additional reason for not printing it is that your plea for Mr. Nazim is unmerited. When the crucial moment came he stooped not for truth but for untruth. I am sorry for him, but I cannot feel with you that the action of authorities was wrong. He made a deliberately false statement when he was challenged and when it was his special duty to make a correct statement. I will not weary you with the full particulars of this painful episode.

I must confess, too, that I do not like your half disobedience of the order of internment. I do not know that you got my message sent to you after my discharge at Bombay that you need not disobey the order of internment and I would like you if you could summon up the courage to recall the notice of disobedience and tell the Viceroy that upon maturer consideration and for the sake of the cause for which you had decided not to disobey the order for the time being. You may not know that in my recent confidential letters to the Viceroy and the Governor of Bombay I have definitely raised the Mahommedan questions confining it to Khalifate and the Holy places.

Please remember me to Amma Saheba and ask the children I forget the names of the blessed ones—to write to me as they did before.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political A, Proceedings, July 1919, 2-32.

19

TELEGRAM FROM MAULANA ABDUL BARI TO THE RIGHT HON'BLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA

Holy places of Islam and Holy Lands which include Jerusalem, Palestine, Damascus, Arabian Peninsula and Mesopotamia should not be allowed to pass under the influence or virtual possession of any non-Muslim Power—Home of the Caliphate, *i.e.*, Constantinople and Adrianople, with all their Islamic monuments and memorials of Islamic greatness should continue under Muslim rule and Mussulmans of India were to feel hurt and exasperated if opposite course adopted. The proposal to convert Mosque of St. Sophia into Church in Constantinople very painful and clearly denotes unnecessary interference with religious institutions quite contrary to the persistent and avowed declaration of Statesman of England and Allies that the Holy and Sacred places of Islam shall remain free from all interference and also to emphatic proclamation made in reply to Shaikh-ul-Islam's declaration of holy war that the war has no religious side whatsoever.

Source **: Government of India, Home Department, Political A. Proceedings, June 1919, 362–76.**

20

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND BY THE MUSSULMANS OF ENGLAND

14 June 1919

1. We, the undersigned Mussulman subjects of His Majesty, resident in England, take the liberty of again addressing you, as the head of His Majesty's Government and the principal custodian of the Empire, on the subject of the threatened dismemberment of Turkey, and on the grave situation of anxiety and uneasiness that this report has created among the Mussulmans, which we are convinced will become aggravated if the design attributed to the Peace Conference is carried into effect.

2. The preservation of Turkey, as declared by you, in your speech delivered on 5th January, 1918, though short of the wishes of the Mussulman Communities themselves, was accepted by them as a sacred pledge, and they relied on it as a solemn guarantee by England that Turkey proper, with

Constantinople as her capital, would be preserved absolutely intact and uninterfered with as an independent State.

3. As Great Britain's sacred pledge, given through the head of His Majesty's Government, which enabled it to carry on the side of the Allies the whole-hearted and loyal support of the Mohammedan subjects of His Majesty in every part of the globe, concerns British honour and British interests far more than those of any of the other Allied and Associated States, we respectfully beg leave to quote your words on the memorable occasion to which we refer. You, Sir, said then :

> 'Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race.'

4. On the 1st January last, we submitted to His Majesty's Government and to yourself a Representation in which we invited your attention to your memorable pronouncement was, as we took it then and take it now, principally addressed to His Majesty's Mussulman subjects, and we ventured to say :

> 'The solemn declaration of the Prime Minister, made only a short time ago, that the Turkish nation will retain their sovereignty unimpaired in their homeland, with Constantinople as the capital of their territories, had reassuring effect on the Mussulman population of India and elsewhere, and we feel certain that any departure from that memorable pronouncement would create the gravest disappointment. The Mussulmans who have shed their blood or helped with their resources in the defence of the Empire are entitled to expect that the principle of national unity and freedom will be maintained in the case of Turkey, as in the case of the European peoples. Any other course would give rise to a most painful impression that the high principles and lofty ideals which secured for the Allied Cause the adhesion and loyal co-operation of the larger part of the Moslem world were abandoned in the case of Turkey because she is a Moslem State. We feel confident, however, that no racial or religious prejudices will be allowed to impair the trust of the Moslem nations in the good faith of the Allies, and that the settlement of this momentous world-problem will be based on the principles of Justice and Equity and of national unity and national rule laid down by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States.
>
> 'In Asia, from the Northern borders of Syria proper upto the Ægean and the Black Sea along its southern littoral as far as the frontiers of Azerbaijan, the population, numbering roughly nineteen to twenty millions, is in some districts exclusively and in others preponderantly Turkish in race and Moslem in faith. In Thrace, also, the conditions are the same, the population is predominantly Turkish. We respectfully

submit that the whole of the territory, with Constantinople as its capital, should be left in the hands of the Turkish nation in accordance with the declaration of the Prime Minister. The right of nations, based on nationality, to remain under their own governments and to possess the power of self-determination, proclaimed and insisted upon the Allies, applies equally to Christians and Moslems. We do not ask for a new status for the Turkish nation; we urge that the Turkish nation should have the same rights as Christian nationalities to hold the territories which they inhabit exclusively, or, where they form the preponderent portion of the population, as they have done heretofore.'

5. The present proposal of dismembering even those Turkish Territories regarding the preservation of which you gave a solemn assurance to His Majesty's Mussulman subjects, who constitute one-fourth of the whole population of the British Empire, and of wresting from Turkey Constantinople and Thrace, has filled every Mussulman throughout the world with dismay. The soldiers who have returned from the war, the civilian population who gave their best to contribute from the victory of the Allies, the princes who placed their resources at the disposal of their sovereign are, speaking with profound respect, aghast at the proposal which, if carried into effect, would involve, we submit, a breach of faith, and create a situation of the utmost anxiety.

6. The statesman who holds, at this moment, in his hands the destinies of the vast population of India, and to whom the Mussulmans of India and elsewhere, in his speech in the Commons spoke of the 'perplexities' on the situation to which the proposal of dismemberment had given rise. The feeling among the Mussulmans is not one of 'perplexity'; they find themselves under the shadow of a great calamity. To think of a city with which all their religious and spiritual life, by tradition, by history, and by associations, is intimately intertwined; to think of a country which has been held by people of their own faith for centuries, long enough to establish the right of any nation; to think that their spiritual head, whose temporal sovereignty is essential to the maintenance of his spiritual dignity, should be expelled with the help and consent of England from the seat of the Caliphate, is to them an indignity and a calamity of the first magnitude. It cannot be a matter of surprise to any unprejudiced observer acquainted with the feelings which animate Islam that the bitterness and sense of injustice are now so deep and universal.

7. We had hoped that in this great and composite Empire, in which the Mussulmans form fully one-fourth of the population, outnumbering every other creed excepting the Hindu, Mussulman feeling would not be disregarded; that their religious sentiments would be respected, and that their aspirations, for their own civilisation and traditions, not in conflict with the interests of the British Empire would be regarded with sympathy. We are grieved beyond measure at the recrudescence in England itself of mediaeval forms of religious animosity. Unworthy devices, some fantastic, others deliberately malevolent,

have been resorted to for the purpose of either nullifying or discrediting Mussulman sentiment. Their religious and most cherished institutions have been subjected to vilification. The seizure of some of their sacred mosques has been publicly advocated, as well as the expulsion of Moslem rule from Thrace and Constantinople, where they form the majority of the population, and the spoliation of their old historic cities like Smyrna, Adalia, and Konieh, for no other reason than to satisfy the greed of other communities, have been put in the foreground of the settlement of western Asia. We beg respectfully to say that this ebullition of religious intolerance will render most difficult the task of the administrators who are anxious to consolidate the different elements of the Empire in the common bond of loyalty and steadfastness to the British Crown.

8. In our Representation, submitted to His Majesty's Government on 3 March 1919, we ventured to say :

> 'The evidence as to the depth of feeling, not only among the vast Mussulman population of India, but also among the Afghans and the frontier tribes (who form the bulk of the Mussulman element in the Indian Army), against the dismemberment of Turkey, and in favour of the preservation of her prestige, is accumulating day by day. We hope that, with the disappearance of the two Empires that had hitherto exploited Asiatic unrest and misgovernment to their own advantage, with a view to final political or economic absorption, the new Peace would assure the pacific development of Western and Middle Asia on durable lines. We fear, however, that the complete and absolute severance from the Turkish Empire of the Provinces whose future status is under consideration will give rise to a rankling sense of injustice.'

Since the above was submitted, the evidence has been accumulating on all sides. There is general consternation and alarm amongst almost all Moslem nations, extending from China to the Atlantic, the Malayan Peninsula, and South Africa, at the impending fate of Turkey. This intensity of feeling appears to be discounting by the suggestion that it is due to German or Turkish intrigues. We are sure that this accusation is wholly unfounded; the excitement is spontaneous and universal. We still venture to hope that the settlement of Turkey will be in accordance with the pledge which you, Sir, as head of His Majesty's Government and the custodian of the vast interests of the Empire gave to the Mussulman world, and thus remove all causes for disappointment and bitterness. We may mention here as one of the lessons of contemporaneous history that the threatened dismemberment of Turkey is denounced as much by the Hindus of India as by the Mussulmans.

9. We again venture to appeal to you for the sake of the fair name of Great Britain and the tranquil development of Asia, that Turkey proper and Thrace, with Constantinople as its capital, should be left intact and uninterfered with, under sovereignty of the Sultan, that his temporal power over the

Turkish state should not be attempted to be reduced or diminished by any sort of Mandate, and that the principle of self-determination which has been applied to the Christian people of Europe, should be made applicable to the Moslem peoples, and that, in the interests of the peaceful development of Western Asia, the suzerainty of the Caliph over the non-Turkish Provinces of the Ottoman Empire be left undisturbed.

Source : **Great Britain, The Moslem of India and Turkey, Six Memorials submitted to His Majesty's Government.**

21

LETTER FROM M. H. ISPAHANI TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

25 June 1919

I am directed by the Committee of the London Moslem League most respectfully to inform you that we have received from an unimpeachable British source an account of the manner in which our Greek Allies celebrated the inauguration of the new regime under the auspices of the Peace Conference on their landing in Smyrna. The narration, harrowing in its details, throws a lurid light on the fate of the Moslems who are being transferred from one sovereignty to another like so many cattle, without any voice in the determination of their disposition.

I am further desired to state most respectfully that when the news of these happenings reaches India, as it must in due course, it will have an unfortunate and tragical effect on His Majesty's Mussulman subjects; they have always believed that England, so long as she had a dominant voice in the Council Chamber of Europe, would not permit people of their faith to be wrenched away and placed under a hated alien rule against their will, and they will rightly or wrongly lay the blame on her for allowing the opportunity for the perpetration of these outrages.

We beg to annex hereto a short narrative of the incidents which followed the Greek landing; and in the name of the thousands of Moslems who have laid down their lives in the cause of England in every part of the globe we respectfully urge that an impartial and unbiassed International Commission, presided over by an English Judge if possible, should be appointed firstly to enquire on the spot into the outrages, and secondly to ascertain the will of the preponderant Moslem population of the districts in Asia Minor and have,

speaking with respect, been arbitrarily assigned to Italy and Greece, as to the Government under which they wish to live.

Source: **Three Memorials submitted to the Right Hon'ble the Prime Minister respecting the Turkish Settlement by the Muslim League.**

22

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND BY THE MUSSULMANS OF ENGLAND

17 July 1919

We, the undersigned subjects of His Majesty now resident in England, beg respectfully to express our great and disappointment at the reply by the Peace Conference to the Turkish delegates' plea for equitable treatment. We had hoped that in adding up the scores against Turkey due weight would be given to the causes that have frustrated her endeavours to march with the requirements of modern progress.

We take upon ourselves to say that no other country has suffered so much as Turkey within the last two centuries from the cupidity and intrigues of her Christian neighbours. From the time of Catherine II of Russia down to 1877 she has been attacked and mutilated at short intervals of twenty to twenty-five years. No breathing time has been allowed to her to devote herself to the task of domestic reform; no respite to engage in the works of peace. Tsarist Russia never wanted a progressive or reformed Turkey, and she was aided and abetted we speak with respect—by most of the other Powers of Europe. And now, Sir, we read with pained surprise that Turkey's inability to organise her government and introduce desirable reforms is made a ground of attack against the Turkish national character as unfit for progress and development, when, in the midst of unceasing external troubles and internal sedition, promoted from outside, the Ottomans had no fair chance of putting their houses in order.

We mention these facts to you, Sir, as we feel assured that you are animated by that sense of justice without which the great settlement in which you are taking such a prominent part will, in our humble judgement, never bear the fruit on which we, in common with all His Majesty's subjects, believe rests the hope of humanity for the peaceful development of the world. Any policy based on vindictiveness or partisanship, however successful for the moment, will leave behind a rankling sense of injustice and sow the seeds of incalculable misery and bitterness amongst the vast populations of Asia and

Africa who follow the Moslem faith, and most of whom acknowledge allegiance to England and France.

We also desire to point out that the existence of Turkey as a powerful State has not been without use to Western Europe. In the 16th and 17th centuries, whenever, France was attacked and nearly overwhelmed by the Hapsburg hordes, it was the Sultan of Turkey whose help used to be invoked, and who invariably came to her assistance and saved her from disaster. We believe that the history of Western Europe would have been differently written had Turkey not existed as a State capable of assisting France in items of distress and danger. With regard to her services to England we might be allowed to mention that over a century ago, when the British were fighting for the dominion of India the Ottoman Sultan wrote to Tippoo Sultan of Mysore, urging him to join hands with England. A reference in the autobiography of the late Ameer Abdur Rahman would also show that Turkish intervention on behalf of the English frustrated within recent times a serious Jehad movement against the British on the frontier of India. Another conspicuous instance is the willing assent of Turkey to the pouring of British troops through Egypt into India which enabled England to crush the great Mutiny. No amount of reference to the Crimean War can belittle the significance or value of these services rendered to the British Empire by the Moslem Caliph. For, if what was considered in later years the right horse had won, Egypt, if not absolutely closed to England, would have caused our Government considerable embarrassment in the passage of British troops expeditiously to India.

We venture to say, Sir, in emphatic terms that no nation has been more tolerant than the Moslems of Turkey to the followers of other creeds. When the Jews of Spain were driven out by fire and sword from the land which had been their home for centuries they found refuge and shelter in Turkey. When Kossuth fled from Hungary he and his fellow patriots found an asylum among the people who are now declared by the Peace Conference to be devoid of nobility of sentiment. It is a well known fact in history that the Turkish authorities refused, notwithstanding the threats of the Emperors of Russia and Austria, to surrender the fugitives to the merciless vengeance of the Austrians. When the monarchs of Europe were engaged in dragooning the peoples whom they had violently brought into subjection to create homogeneous nations, Turkey had guaranteed to each community and each creed the free enjoyment of its separate laws and institutions under its own religious and communal heads. The generous tolerance shown by the Turkish Sovereigns in the plenitude of their power has been repaid by constant treason and perpetual intrigue with neighbouring hostile States. And this treasonable conduct has no doubt often been repressed by violent and ruthless methods. We would like to know, Sir, what nation in the world is free from the charge of ruthless repression of treason and insurrectionary movement.

We read in the public Press that the design of the Peace Conference is to

'pen in the Moslem nation of Turkey within the plateau of Anatolia without any outlet to the sea or means of access to the markets of the world except through the favour of implacable enemies. If this statement be true, it means that they would be permanently cut off from communication with their co-religionists in other parts of the world except through the generosity or favour of other Governments more or less hostile to them; that they would be debarred from free inter-association with other nations; that they would be deprived of all means of progress; that they would be deprived of all touch with the modern world; that they would have no chance of development and that their women, who have attained a remarkable degree of culture and freedom, will have to forgo all the advantages gained after years of struggle and would relapse to mediaeval conditions. If this is the design of the Peace Conference, we take at once the liberty, as British subjects entitled to place constitutionally before you as the chief custodian of the interests of the Empire, our emphatic and indignant protest on behalf of the whole of India.

It is not necessary for us to refer again to the state of feeling of the Moslems of India on the subject of the proposed dismemberment of Turkey, as your attention has already been drawn to it in three separate memorials submitted to you on January 1st, March 3rd, and June 14th respectively. But we think it right to bring respectfully to your notice the fact that they feel at this moment overwhelmed with the sense of a great calamity, and take little or no interest in the proposed constitutional reforms. The avowals in the public Press that the institutions which they cherish and in which they take a pride should be crushed; that their civilisation which they value should be replaced in a country which has been held by Moslems for centuries by alien civilisations with all their concomitants, casinos, gambling dens, liquor shops, and other undesirable adjuncts, revolting to their feelings and antagonistic to their religion, have given rise to a bitterness which, looking at it in the interests of the Empire, we cannot regard without the gravest anxiety.

In 1765 the Emperor Shah Alam II granted to the East India Company the Dewani of three of the most important provinces of the Empire. In 1802 Lord Lake obtained for the Company the delegation of the Imperial authority. Since that time the Mussulmans of India have stood steadfastly by the British Throne. The present utter disregard of their feelings and sentiments has created an estrangement which, whilst we deplore, we fully understand. They appear to have lost faith in the solemn pledges that have repeatedly been given to the Mussulman nation and the Mussulman soldiers who have fought and died for the British cause that Turkish sovereignty over Thrace, Constantinople, and Asia Minor would remain absolutely intact and uninterfered with.

It has been repeatedly asserted in the Press by some of our Christian fellow-subjects, who have no scruple in rekindling the flames of religious hatred, that the present sympathy of the Mussulmans of India with their Turkish co-religionists, and their interest in the preservation and maintenance

of the Ottoman sovereignty over Constantinople and the regions in respect of which you, Sir, gave the Mussulman world a solemn pledge, are new born and fictitious. We beg respectfully to denounce this statement as a malevolent accusation. When Turkey was in no danger, when her existence was regarded by both France and England as essential to the maintenance of political equilibrium, neither the Moslems of India nor of any other part of the world had reason to placard their sympathy or proclaim it in the Press. In 1856 they saw England and France fighting alongside her, and they were content to believe that their cherished religious institutions were safeguarded by two of the greatest States in the vanguard of civilisation. In 1877, however, when Constantinople was, as now, in danger, a thrill went through the heart of Islam in India, and the sympathy with their Turkish co-religionists was universal. Large sums were subscribed for the relief of the widows and orphans of Turkish soldiers. Luckily England intervened to stop the Russian attack, and Mussulman excitement subsided. When Italy and the Balkan States afterwards attacked Turkey the excitement was far greater, and sympathy deeper. As a matter of fact these feelings have grown in intensity as the danger to Mussulman interests and to the territories of Turkey as an independent State has grown.

In conclusion we beg to invite your special attention to the fact that the great victories in Asia which brought about the collapse of the Central Powers were achieved by the valour of Indian soldiers including the best of Moslem soldiers, as was recently acknowledged by the Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons. At the beginning of the war these soldiers rendered invaluable help in holding back the German armies in Flanders at a time when the situation was most critical. Is it just, is it fair, is it right we venture to ask, that the Moslem soldiers and their countrymen who have so directly and substantially helped in the achievement of victory should have no voice in the settlement of the destiny of the Turkish Empire, and that their views should be set aside in favour of those whose territorial ambitions have been aroused by the secret treaties, but whose part in the defeat of Turkey has been insignificant ? We firmly believe that this vital fact will appeal to the sense of fairness of the British nation, whom it is your privilege to lead at a momentous juncture when India is watching with tense anxiety the attitude of Great Britain and her Allies towards the Caliphate.

We again venture to appeal to you, Sir, that, having regard to the universal sentiment of the world of Islam, and especially of His Majesty's Indian subjects, to use your powerful influence to bring about a settlement in accord with the assurance which was accepted by India and the Islamic world as a solemn pledge on behalf of His Majesty's Government.

Source : **Great Britain, The Moslems of India and Turkey, Six Memorials submitted to His Majesty's Government.**

23

MUSLIM FEELINGS ALL OVER INDIA TO PROTEST AGAINST THE DISMEMBERMENT OF TURKEY

A public meeting was held on Thursday, September 11, in the Town Hall to consider the prevalence of suffering amongst the people of Bengal, to protest against the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, to express disappointment at the composition of the Commission to inquire into the Punjab affairs and to pray for the inclusion of a third Indian member in the Commission, to protest against the proposed Indemnity Bill, to urge upon the Government to proclaim amnesty to. prisoners sentenced in the recent riots. There were two meetings, one in the ground floor of the hall and the other on the staircase leading to the hall. Mr. Motilal Ghose presided at the principal meeting, while Mr. C. R. Das presided over the other meeting, and the same presidential speech was read at both the meetings, and the same resolutions were carried.

Touching upon the Turkish question, in the course of his speech Babu Motilal Ghose, the President, said :

Gentlemen, while the world war was going on we heard much about the pious, Christian and very virtuous motives with which it was waged. We heard that it was a war to end war, and that there was no motive of territorial or military aggrandisement behind it. It seems to me that these cries have grown somewhat faint since the conclusion of peace; and now we hear that there is one Power at least which is going to be shorn of a considerable portion of its possessions on the plea of readjustment of territories on a racial basis. We are told that Turkey is pre-eminently an Asiatic Power, and as such should be confined to Asia only while the possessions in the European continent which have been under her sovereignty for more than 400 years, should be created into a separate and independent territory. If this logic is to hold good in the case of Turkey, could it not be said upon the strength of logic, equally irrepressible, that France is a European Power and should keep off from Africa, and the England also is a European Power, and, as such, should keep her hands off from Africa and Asia. But we forget that there is one sauce for the goose and another for the gender; and that what is sound constitutional law in the case of Turkey is incapable of application in the case of other European Powers. England often boasts that she is an Islamic Power herself, and it cannot be denied that 80 millions of Mahommedans are included among her subject races. These 80 millions of Mahommedans, in spite of strong religious sympathy with the Turks, faithfully and loyally stood by the side of Great Britain during the recent world crisis; and ordinary human gratitude, if nothing else, ought to have made Great Britain sympathetic and considerate

towards the susceptibilities of this vast Islamic population. It is a recorded historical fact that within very recent times it was the influence of the Turkish Sultan which prevented a serious *jehad* from being waged on the Western frontier of India.

RESOLUTION

That in view of the fact that the eighty millions of Indian Mussulmans owe allegiance to the British Crown, and further, in view of the fact that the contemplated dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and the parcelling out of Thrace and Constantinople (the homeland of the Turks) in gross violation of all principles of freedom, justice and self-determination, and in direct conflict with all canons of political and international morality, has given rise to intense bitterness and resentment not only among the Muslims throughout the country, but also among all Indians and Asiatics, this public meeting of the citizens of Calcutta desires to impress upon the British Government the absolute necessity of respecting the views and sentiments of the Muslims and Asiatics, and urging upon the Peace Conference the settlement of the Turkish question on an equitable basis so as to prevent a dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and for safeguarding holy places, sacred shrines and mosques so that they may remain under the sovereignty of an independent Muslim monarch, viz., the Sultan of Turkey.

CALCUTTA

Under the auspices of the Bengal Presidency Muslim League a largely attended public meeting of Muslims of all shades of opinion was held at the Indian Association Hall on Sunday September 14, at 4 p.m., to elect delegates to the All-India Muslim Conference to be held at Lucknow on September 21, to give an effective expression to Muslim feeling in India in regard to the Turkish question. The attendence was so large that there was scarcely any standing room in the hall.

Moulvi Azizul Huq, B. L., then moved the following resolution :

That the following gentlemen be elected delegates to the forthcoming All-India Muslim Conference to be held at Lucknow on September 21, 1919, to give an effective expression to Muslim feeling in India in regard to the Turkish question.

The resolution was seconded by Moulvi Md. Mohiruzzaman, and was unanimously passed.

ALLAHABAD

A public meeting of the Muslims of Allahabad was held here on September 16, with the Hon. Syed Riza Ali in the chair, and resolutions were adop-

ted protesting against threatened dismemberment of Turkey, and demanding redemption of pledges.

CHANDPUR

About 4,000 Mussulman subjects of His Imperial Majesty assembled on September 6, 1919, for Eid prayer, at the Chandpur Jama Mosque where the following resolution was passed unanimously :

Resolved that the Mussulmans of Chandpur view with alarm the proposed dismemberment of the Turkish Empire in spite of the clear and unequivocal assurances and pledges by the Prime Minister of His Majesty's Government and the Secretary of State for India, and emphatically protest, against such proposal and urge upon the Prime Minister to use his influence to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire as in the case of other belligerent States so that Thrace, Constantinople, Asia Minor, and the Arabian Peninsula may remain under the Sultan of Turkey, the Khalifa of Islam.

RAOZAN

Raozan (Chittagong) Mussulmans assembled at Eid prayer sent two telegrams to Prime Minister proposed Turkey's dismemberment, supporting London Muslims' Memorial, and praying preservation of sovereignty of the Khalifa of Islam over Constantinople and Muslim Holy Places.

HYDERABAD (SINDH)

On Saturday, June 1, just before the Eid prayers, about ten thousand Mussulmans passed the following resolution, which has been, in accordance with the request of the people, cabled to the Right Hon. the Premier, by the Hon. Mr. Ghulam Hussain :

Ten thousand Mussulmans of Hyderabad Sind, assembled at the Idgah, most strongly support the memorials submitted by Muslim Indian leaders to the Right Hon the Premier on the question of the future of the Turkish Empire and the Khilafat, and appeal to the Premier to use his personal influence and the weight of Britain on the side of the Muslim subjects of the King Emperor.

TERIAIL

Great excitement was felt here during the Eid prayers over the proposed separation of the Holy Places from the Turkish rule, and the following telegram has been addressed to Chief Secretary, to be communicated to the Prime Minister :

'Local Mussulmans assembled at Eid prayers emphatically protest against the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, and most earnestly pray to Prime Minister to assert his power at the Peace Conference, so as not to

exclude from the Kaliphate the province of Thrace with Constantinople, Asia Minor and Arabia.

BERHAMPORE

Murshidabad Muslims assembled at Eid prayer strongly protested against the proposed dismemberment of Turkey and wired to Prime Minister and Viceroy to intercede.

CALCUTTA

At a congregation of Mussulmans at the Mosque at to Elliott Lane, Calcutta, the following resolution was adopted after the Eid prayer :

That this assembly prays to the British Government to use its influence at the Peace Conference against the proposed dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, so that the question of Khilafat may not be interfered with in any way.

Proposed by Dr. Haji Syed Mahmudullah.

Seconded by Mr. M. Hashem Khan.

DACCA

A crowded meeting of the Muslim students of Dacca was held on Sunday, September 7, to protest against the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The following resolutions were unanimously passed :

(1) That this meeting express its allegiance and loyalty to the British Crown.

(2) That this meeting enters its strong and emphatic protest against the proposed dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire and appeals to the British Government to use their influence at the Peace Conference to keep the Ottoman Empire intact.

(3) That this meeting resolves that the Muslim students are even now as unwilling to dabble in politics as they were before, but they will not sit idle in future if the British delegates, whom they believe to have great influence at the Peace Conference, do not try their utmost to bring about such a solution of the Turkish question as will be favourable to the whole Muslim world.

BASIRHAT

The Mussulmans of Basirhat (24-Parganas) assembled at the Shahi Mosque, passed a resolution, after the Eid prayer, strongly protesting against the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. The resolution was wired to the Prime Minister.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, 1919.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED IN THE MEETING OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM CONFERENCE HELD AT LUCKNOW

21 September 1919

The All India Muslim Conference held at Lucknow on September 21, unanimously passed the following resolutions :

1. That in the opinion of this Conference the question of the spiritual position of the Sultan of Turkey as Kaliph, Islamic world, is indissolubly bound up with his temporal power as Ruler, and the contemplated dismemberment of Turkey and the creation of a number of smaller State out of the component parts of the Turkish Empire with non-Muslim powers as mandatories is an intolerable interference with the Khilafat which would sow seeds of permanent discontent in the Muslim world.

2. That this Conference strongly protests against Syria, Pelestine, Mesopotamia, and Armenia, where the population is almost exclusively or predominantly Muslim in faith, being formed into separate State with non-Muslim Powers as mandatories in direct conflict with the principle of self-determination laid down by the Allied and Associated Powers themselves, and this Conference urges that the principle applied to the Christian peoples of Europe should also be applied to the aforesaid countries under the suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey, and any difference in the treatment of Christian and Muslim population is sure to give rise to feelings of deep discontent and alarm in the minds of His Majesty's Muslim subjects, with whose help the war has been brought to a victorious termination.

3. That this Conference views with the indignation and dismay the reports regarding the internationalisation of Constantinople and cession of a portion of Thrace to Greece, which not only militate against the principle of self-determination and justice, but would also be a direct breach of the pledges given by the Prime Minister in his speech of January 5, 1918, in the name of the British Empire.

4. That this Conference strongly condemns the absolutely unjustifiable encroachment of Greece upon the Turkish territories in Asia Minor, and regards its toleration by the Allied Powers as opposed to all the principles of justice and protection of weak States, and is convinced that the Greek occupation of Smyrna is fraught with great danger to future peace of Western Asia, and respectfully calls upon His Majesty's Prime Minister to secure the immediate evacuation of the said territories in Asia Minor and thus put an end to the perpetration of brutal deeds of violence by the Greeks which crimes have produced thrills of horror and indignation throughout the Islamic world.

5. That this Conference, in accordance with the desire of the Mussulmans of India to express their feelings on the Turkish question by holding simultaneous meetings all over India, fixes Friday, October 17, as the day on which

this might be done and prayers offered for the safety and integrity of the Khilafat.

6. That this Conference approves of the establishment of the Khilafat Committee of Bombay and recommends the formation of branches all over the country to give effect to its objects.

DAY OF PRAYER FOR THE SULTAN—CALIPH

On Friday, October 17 (the day appointed by the All-India Muslim Conference held at Lucknow on 21 September 1919), a large congregation assembled at the Muslim Prayer House (III, Campden Hill Road). After regular Friday prayers, the following prayer was recited :

'O Allah ! Owner of sovereignty. Thou givest sovereignty to whom Thou wilt, and Thou takest sovereignty away from whom thou wilt. In Thy hand is the good. Varily Thou hast absolute control of all things.

'Preserve, we pray Thee, our Khalifah and Imam, the revered successor of Thy final Prophet (upon whom be blessings), Thy servant and our brother in Islam, the prince of believers Muhammad Mahid-ud-din Khan and Khagan, Sultan of Turkey and Defender of the Faith. Bless, support and strengthen him in this hour of trial and adversity. Preserve him and his kingdom to us, if it be Thy will. Frustrate the schemes of those who would destroy Islamic unity, of those who would bring back into Islam the errors of the days of ignorance. Help us, O Lord, against the schemes of unbelieving people.

'O Allah ! we have wronged our own souls. We acknowledge our sins, for truly none forgiveth sins save Thee alone. Purify our conduct and our hearts by Thy forgiveness that we who oft have fallen short of our Islamic duty in the past may be more worthy of our high vocation for the future; and that the Muslim body under the revered Khilafat of the House of Ottoman may become in truth Thy kingdom upon earth, the home of peace and righteousness and human brotherhood and human progress a blessing to all peoples in the world.'

A meeting was then held under the chairmanship of Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, who made the following speech :

Muslims,

This day has been set apart by our brethren throughout India for solemn prayer to Allah for the preservation of the Ottoman Khilafat. Is the Khilafat, then, a danger ? You may ask. We hope and pray that it is not; but there are signs which make us anxious. At the beginning of the war there were distressing rumours to the effect that the religious headship of the Muslim world was being actually hawked about by representatives of certain Christian Powers, offered to persons whom few Muslim would accept as representative. Then there has been, and still is, an attempt upon the part of Christian Powers to introduce into Islam the irreligious, anti-human error

of aggressive nationalism—that poison which has wrecked the life of half the world—an evil which Islam abolished for all true believers.

There have been attempts by Christians to persuade us Muslims that the Khilafat should be hereditary in the Prophet's family, and that, because our Holy Prophet was an Arab, his successor always ought to be an Arab too. The fact is that the Holy Prophet, far from wishing to set up a dynasty, left the succession open to all Muslims with no other text than that of conduct, backed up by strong position and the approval of the congregation. He said that an Ethopian slave who did right was more worthy of the leadership than a Sherif of Coreysh who did wrong. The Prophet (may God bless and keep him) was no Arab nationalist. He ceased to be an Arab in the nationalistic sense upon the day when he received his mission from on High. He abolished Arab nationality for all his followers, instituting in its stead that new and wonderful brotherhood—in very truth the Kingdom of God on earth—in which the Ethiopian slave was on an equal footing with the Sherif of Coreysh, in which the only test was that of conduct.

These attempts, and rumours of attempts, so utterly against Islamic principles, made by the Christian Powers, roused very angry feelings in the Muslim world. The question of the Khilafat is no concern of Christians any more than it is the concern of Muslims to decide who shall be Pope of Rome. The Muslim world as a whole accepts the Ottoman Sultan as its Khalifah with enthusiasm and impassioned sympathy; and it is well that Christian powers should know that this is so and that by instigating or encouraging another claimant they can do no more than make a wicked and a useless schism in the Muslim world, a cause of much ill-feeling, strife and future bloodshed. What have we done to them that they should injure and insult us ? We are not dangerous to any-one if we are left alone. All we ask is to preserve our unity, to be allowed to pursue in peace the straight path of progress which Allah has appointed for us, to improve and to advance in our own way. In the course of history, by God's decree, the Khilafat passed from an Arab to a Turkish dynasty, and in our own day the Khilafat of the House of Ottoman has become identified with Muslim progress. That the sentiment of Islam is not anti-European in this matter is proved by the fact that it is our earnest wish that our Khalifah should remain one of the Powers of Europe. All we ask is that Europe shall give up attacking him, and as through him, and shall accord to him and us the right of nations. In praying for the preservation of the Ottoman Khilafat, we pray for the future peace and welfare both of East and West.

TELEGRAM TO H. I. M. THE SULTAN—CALIPH

It was decided that the above resolution should be forwarded at once to the Prime Minister in the name of the Muslim Congregation in London; and that a telegram should also be dispatched to H. I. M. the Sultan—Caliph,

Constantinople, in the following terms :

'Muslim Congregation, London, including Sunni, Shia, of various races, to-day pray for your Majesty and affirm their unalterable devotion to your Majesty as Caliph.'

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted :

1. That this meeting places on record the fact that the Sultans of Turkey have been for many centuries past the recognised Khalifahs of the Muslim World and Custodians of the Holy Places and honour of Islam, and that the present Sultan of Turkey occupies, in relation to the Muslim world the same position as his predecessors occupied.

2. That this meeting emphasises the necessity of the political independence of the Islamic Khalifah and protests against attempts made by non-Muslim Powers to curtail such political independence and integrity of his dominions.

3. That this meeting protest, in the strongest language at its command, against the systematic vilification, in the European Press, of the Turkish patriots who to-day are endeavouring to retrieve the mistakes committed during the past 'few years' and who are using every legitimate endeavour to stem the tide of unwarranted aggression on Islamic territories by certain European and Christian nationalities, more especially the Greeks and the Armenians.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, October, 1919.

24

PRAYER FOR THE SAFETY OF OTTOMAN KHILAFAT AND EMPIRE

30 October 1919

Friday, October 17, was observed throughout India as the Khilafat Day. Hundreds of thousands of Mussulmans usually assemble in mosques on Fridays, but on this particular Friday consecrated for a holy and beloved object, the number was multiplied many time over, and what is more remarkable thousands of Hindus drawn by the bond of fellowship also flocked to the mosques to demonstrate their active sympathy with their Muslim brethren, and to take part in all that is being done to avert the calamity that threatens the Muslim world and Asia. Inteuse prayers went forth to the Almighty God from millions of throbbing hearts of Mussulmans and Hindus, and resolutions

were passed praying the British Government to use its good offices at the Peace Conference in bringing about such a settlement of the Turkish question as would not outrage the feelings of the millions of Mussulmans who owe allegiance to the British Crown. God grant that the Allies in general and the British in particular may at length be brought to realise the gravity and true inwardness of the situation, and save Islam and the British Empire from the dreadful consequences that must ensue if the decision of the Peace Conference with regard to Turkey is unjust.

THE 'TIMES' REPORT

The '*Times*' correspondent wired from Bombay on October 17 :

Throughout India to-day Mahommedans have prayed for the permanence of the temporal power of the Caliph. In Bombay, after prayers in the chief mosque, a public meeting of Mahommedans was held, expressing anxiety and indignation over the threatened dismemberment of Turkey and the removal of the Holy Places of Islam from the control of the Caliph, and trusting that the British Government will secure the fulfilment of the Prime Minister's pledge regarding Turkey and thereby restore the confidence of the Mahommedan subjects of the King.

The intensity of Mahommedan feeling on this subject presumably is now well known in England, but several points connected with to-day's celebration deserve notice. The occasion has been siezed by the Hindus to strengthen the bond of union between them and the Mahommedans. Mr. Gandhi proclaimed that to-day the Hindus should fast and pray, thus putting a sacred seal on the Hindu-Mahommedan bond. He also ordained that the shops should be closed, and everyone remain indoors, but he suggested that as any breach of peace would simply mar a most excellent cause; the mill hands should not be encouraged to leave work, and that the Government should not interfere either directly or indirectly with this peaceful demonstration.

Were it a question of the Caliphate only the Shiah Mahommedans would not have violated the principles of their religion and piloted an agitation for the integrity of the Caliphate, which opposed their religious beliefs. So heartily have all classes and sects of Mahommedans joined in prayer and fast today that it is credibly reported that not a single Muslim eating-house is open in Bombay to-day, a phenomenon not even seen in the fasting days of Ramadhan. Cynics may think the closure of the local Stock Exchange still more remarkable, since Bombay is preoccupied with share gambling. At one meeting to-day it was resolved that Mahommedans should not participate in the coming Peace celebrations.

CABLEGRAMS

The Hon. Yakub Hasan, Honorary Secretary, All India Muslim League Delegation, has received the following cablegrams for submission to the Prime

Minister and Secretary of State for India and the Foreign Secretary :

DACCA, 19 October 1919

Mass meeting held here on the 17th, about twenty thousand Mussulmans attended. Hindu leaders joined. Strongly protested against dismemberment of Ottoman Empire and Greek outrages. —Khaja Abdul Karem, Secretary, Islamia, Anjuman, Dacca, India.

LUCKNOW, 18 October 1919.

After solemn Friday prayer and prayers for continuance and stability of temporal power of Khalifat-ul-Muslamin Mussulmans of Lucknow, together with Hindu sympathisers assembled in public meeting express their horror and indignation at unfair, unjust attitude adopted by Peace Conference towards Turkish Empire by proposing its dismemberment and depriving Holy Places of Islam of the protection of Khalifa. Such proposals are sure to create permanent feeling of bitterness and discontent in minds of Mussulmans, and bring directly opposed to their religious feelings and sentiments, and constituting distinct violation of pledges given to them by British Ministers will never be acceptable to and binding on Mussulmans if carried into effect by Peace Conference. —Mumtaz Husain, President, Meeting.

BOMBAY, 17 October 1919.

Fifty thousand Mussulmans of Bombay assembled in mass meeting held in Jumma Masjid after Friday prayers passed the following resolution which I beg to forward. This public meeting of the Mussulmans of Bombay assembled in the Jumma Mosque and held after solemn Friday prayers for the continuance and permanence of the temporal power of Khalifat-ul-Musslimin expresses its greatest anxiety and indignation over the threatened dismemberment of Turkey and the removal of the Holy Places of Islam from the Kalifa's control, and trusts that His Majesty's Ministers will secure fulfilment of the pledge of the Right Hon. Lloyd George given on behalf of the British Empire regarding Turkey, and thereby restore the confidence of the Mussulman subjects of His Majesty. This meeting approves of the proceedings and adopts the resolutions passed by the All-India Moslem Conference held at Lucknow on 21 September 1919. —Haji Mian Mohd. Chotani, President of Mass Meeting.

MADRAS, 18 October 1919

Great public meeting held Khilafat Day October 17, huge and unprecedented audience, Mussulmans and Hindus, entered solemnly unanimous protest against proposed dismemberment Turkish Empire, internationalisation Constantinople, placing Muslim Holy Places under other than Turkish control, and respectfully warn Government against such perilous step of British Government signing Peace Treaty against unanimous opinion.—Khan Bahadur Kudus Badsha, President.

MASULIPATAM, 19 October 1919

Khalifat Day observed Masulipatam. Hindus, Mussulmans passed resolutions. Cabled Premier, Secretary State-Vamuri Subbarow, President (Hindu).

TANJORE, 19 October 1919

Tanjore Mussulmans, non-Muslims strongly of opinion dismemberment Turkish Empire cause of greatest harm to Empire, Muslim religion and Khalifate, disapprove dismemberment, respectfully pray King-Emperor refuse consent, such step to present deep resentment minds of all citizens of Empire. —Rao Bahadur Srinivasa Pillay (Hindu).

VANIYAMBADI, 18 October 1919

Mussulmans and Hindus of Vaniyambadi in public meeting held October 17 beg to bring before His Imperial Majesty's Government their anxiety indignation at proposed dismemberment of Turkey, which will remove Holy Places of Islam from Khalifa's control, and insist upon fulfilment of Premier's pledge regarding Turkey thereby restoring confidence of Mussulmans and Hindus of India. —Khan Badruddeen Sahib, President.

The mass meeting held 17th, Ambur, Madras Presidency respectfully urge upon the Government of His Britannic Majesty to refuse to sign such Peace Treaty which will dismember Turkish Empire violating the interests of His Imperial Majesty's Mussulman subjects.—Abdullah Sahib, President.

KUMBAKONAM, 18 October 1919

Influential meeting held Central Musjid Kumbakonam, Tanjore District, Muslims, Hindus, thousands attending view with dismay contemplated dismemberment Turkish Empire, internationlising Constantinople, ceding Thrace to Greece, giving European Powers mandates over Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and urge application principle self-determination to Muslims, Christians, alike, fulfilling pledges of Premier and earnestly entreat leaving Caliphate intact and Sultan's spiritual and temporal power unimpaired.—Muthu Kumara Chettiar, President (Hindu).

KUMBAKONAM, 18 October 1919

Thousands of Muslims supported by Hindus public meeting 17th, at Pandaravadai, Papanasam Taluk, Tanjore District, view with indignation and alarm proposed dismemberment Turkey into small States under non-Muslims, and relying on pledge given by Premier urges respectfully Government to refuse assent Treaty violation pledges given or interests of His Majesty's Muslim subjects or sanctity of Holy Places as Islam's spiritual position is inseparable from its temporal power.—Moulvi Sheikh Abdul Cader Sahib, President.

KUMBAKONAM, 18 October 1919

Thousands of Muslims supported by Hindus public meeting, 17th, at Rajaghiri, Papanasam Taluk, Tanjore District, view with indignation and alarm proposed dismemberment Turkey into small States under non-Muslims, and relying on pledge given by Premier urge respectfully Government to refuse assent Treaty violation pledges given or interests of His Majesty's Muslim subjects or sanctity of Holy Places as Islam's spiritual position is inseparable from its temporal power.—Rao Bahadur N. Krishnaswami Anuangal President (Hindu).

NAGORE, 18 October 1919

Resolution passed public meeting Nagore under auspices of Muslim Association, Nagore, after special prayers Post Jumma (Friday) under presidentship Hon. Khan Bahadur Ahmed Thamby Maricair. Meeting emphatically protests against proposed dismemberment Turkish Empire, Holy Places, respectfully prays British Cabinet be pleased refuse sign Peace contravening Premier's solemn pledges and loyal Muslims' wishes.—Secretaries, Muslim Association, Nagore, Tanjore District.

BEZWADA, 17 October 1919

Monster meeting Mussulmans, Hindus Bezwada, strongly protest contemplated dismemberment Turkey, internationalising Turkey.—Chairman.

TINNEVELLY, 18 October 1919

Muslims Pettai Tinnevelly assembled in Mosque after Jumma prayed seventeenth for safe integrity of Khilaphat protested Turkish dismemberment unanimously adopted first four resolutions Lucknow Conference of September 21 with bitter feelings of sorrow.—Shaik Ebrahim.

DHARAMAPURI, 18 October 1919

That Mussulmans of Dharmapuri in mass meeting respectfully urge upon the Government of His Britannic Majesty to refuse to sign any such Peace Treaty which will violate the interests of His Imperial Majesty's Mussulman subjects.—Mohamed Khan Mettadhar.

TIRVADI, 18 October 1919

The Muslims and Hindus of Tirvadi and its suburbs in meeting assembled respectfully appeal to His Majesty's Government to maintain the integrity and independence of the Khilaphat and to refuse to sign and Peace terms which will affect the interest of the Muslims of India.—Sultan Syed Ahmed, President of the Meeting.

OORGAUM, KOLAR GOLD FIELDS
(MYSORE PROVINCE), 17 October 1919

Muslims Kolar Gold Field in mass meeting express loyalty to His Majesty King-Emperor, and feel seriously hurt if present Turkish Government and Kaliphate be dismembered.—Mohamed Asif Mehkri Sahib.

ERODE, 18 October 1919

Request Premier to maintain Turkish Empire's integrity as assured and not to wound religious feelings of Muslims.—The Khilafat Committee, Erode, Coimbatore District.

ERODE, 18 October 1919

Request Premier non-molestation of Muslim religious feelings and undismemberment of Turkish Empire's integrity.—The Khilafat Committee, Peryagraram, Madras Presidency.

TANJORE, 18 October 1919

Mussulmans and Hindus in meeting held at Ammaper, Tanjore, pray His Majesty's Government to refuse to sign on treaty which violates Mussulman interests.—Mohamed Shariff Sahib.

The following cablegram was received by the Central Islamic Society, 158, Fleet Street, London :

GAYA, 18 October 1919

Gaya district Muslims pray continual and permanency Khilafat's temporal power. Express indignation against Turkey's dismemberment and removal Holy Places from Khalifa's control. Trust fulfilment British Premier's pledge regarding Turkey and Holy Places leading restoration confidence in Indian Muslims and accept Lucknow Muslim Conference resolutions.
—President of the Khilafat Committee.

The following cablegrams were received by the Hon. G.M. Bhurgri, 48, Priory Road, to be submitted to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for India, and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs :

KARACHI, 18 October 1919

Karachi Mussulmans' public meeting held after solemn Friday prayers and prayers for continuance permanence Khalifat-ul-Muslemin temporal power. Approved proceedings and adopted all resolutions All-India Muslim Conference Lucknow of 21 September. Expresses greatest anxiety indignation over threatened dismemberment Turkey, removal Islam's Holy Places from Khalifa's control and trusts His Majesty's Ministers secure fulfilment Right

Hon. Lloyd George's pledges given behalf British Empire regarding Turkey, otherwise there will inevitably be created upheaval among Muslims threatening peace progress of world generally, and giving rise strong deep-rooted discontent within British Empire particularly.—Haji Abdullah Haroon.

HYDERABAD (SIND), 18 October 1919

In mass meeting Mussulmans appeal maintenance independence of Turkey and Khilafat. Non-interference Jazeeratullarab condemn Greek atrocities and occupation urge your intervention. Resolutions posted.

—Abdulmajid, Editor, Alamin.

ULEMA'S MEETING

A public meeting of the Mussulmans under the presidentship of Moulvi Shah Mohammad Mohiuddin was held on 12 September under the auspices of Anjomane Refahul Muslemin, Phulwarisharif, Patna. The meeting was attended by the learned and Muslim religious heads.

The following resolutions were moved and unanimously passed :

RESOLUTION 1

(Sent to the Prime Minister, England, by wire) : 'Public meeting Anjomane Refahul Muslemin, Phulwarisharif, Patna, thanking Secretary of State for placing Muslim religious sentiments before Peace Conference strongly supports London Muslim views against Turkey' dismemberment contrary consideration will irreparably wound feelings of loyal Muslim subject.'

RESOLUTION 2

The Anjoman is most grateful to the non-Muslim gentlemen for their taking active part and showing their heartfelt sympathy in the Muslim views. The Anjoman hopes that they will continue their effective and passionate support of the Muslim feelings.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, October, 1919.

25

LETTER FROM FAZL-UL-HAQ TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE

Calcutta, 14 October 1919

Sir, May I solicit the courtesy of a little space in your columns for the discussion of a matter of the most vital importance to the interests of the cause of nationalism throughout India ?

The matter is briefly this. During my stay at Lucknow on the occasion of the sitting of the All-India Moslem Conference regarding the future of Turkey, I was told by the Secretary of the All-India Moslem League that there was a proposal on foot to hold the annual session of the League at a place away from where the Congress will be held. It was also suggested to me that the Hon'ble Harun Jafar has made a definite suggestion that the League sitting should meet in a town in Sind—I forget the name just now—close to where the All India Mahommedan Educational Conference is going to be held.

I said nothing to the Secretary at that time. I did not consider that the proposal to hold the sitting of the League away from the Congress could be seriously entertained for a moment. I left Lucknow and went to Simla where again I was told by some members of the Imperial Legislative Council that steps would be taken to have the League session at a place different from where the Congress will be held. The Hon. Nawab Syed Nawab Ali Chowdhury even told me that a 'mandate' to this effect had been sent down to Lucknow. From all that I heard at Simla, I have the best of reason to suspect that a serious attempt is being made to separate the All-India Moslem League from the National Congress.

There may be certain reasons why it may be advisable to arrange the meetings of the League so as to avoid giving the impression that the Mussulmans of India have lost their distinct individuality and have emerged their own political creed wholly into the tenets of the Congress into the philosophy and celestial wisdom of such a course of separatism, I do not wish to enter; but I would like to enter a most emphatic protest against any underhand methods being adopted, to raise a discordant note in the harmony that prevails in the political professions of two great communities in India. The Hindu-Moslem compact is now a settled fact in Indian politics, and under the mercy of Providence the unity that has been brought about by the League and the Congress is bound to grow with the lapse of years. It is therefore nothing short of sacrilege to try to create a breach between the two communities whom recent extents in India have managed to bring together into the folds of an almost indissoluble union. I therefore wish to take this opportunity

through the medium of your esteemed journal, to raise a note of warning to the members of the League against all surreptitious method of scheming persons bent on creating a breach between the two communities. The questions of deciding the venue of the annual session will come up very soon before the Council of the League, and members must exercise their vote with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to their decision. Let them also remember the important issues at stake and record their votes accordingly.

Source: The Tribune, 1 November, 1919.

26

CABLEGRAM FROM THE KHILAFAT COMMITTEE OF LUCKNOW TO THE ISLAMIC INFORMATION BUREAU, LONDON

3 November 1919

Khilafat Committee, Lucknow, views with despair attitude of British Cabinet towards Turkish Question as disclosed by Premier's Sheffield speech. Committee cannot help characterising Premier's utterance as anti-Turkish as well as anti-Muslim. It deplores that a Government which claims to rule over largest number of Muslim subjects should so complacently trample over Muslim religious sentiments, forgetting its own pledges given to Muslim world during the war and disregarding universal Muslim protests made in this behalf. Speech foreshadows nature of settlement likely to be made at Peace Conference having regard to future peace of world in general and of India in particular. Only power that should represent Muslim view point and spouse cause of Islam is British, but which committee regrets to find is deliberately ignoring Muslim universal opinion, Committee in interest of peace and goodwill warns British Cabinet not to persist in said attitude, as India is threatened by a colossal religious agitation endangering good faith and prestige of British Government. —Mumtaz Hussain, President.

MAYAVARAM, 18 October 1919

Mussulmans, Hindus, Christians, Mayavaram mass meeting October 17 respectfully urge Britannic Majesty refuse sign treaty dismembering Turkey affecting temporal spiritual power wherein Indian Mussulmans deeply interested. —Chairman, Public Meeting.

The Pall Mall Gazette has received the following cablegram from Chittagong :

Beg leave to submit following resolutions adopted at Hindu-Mussulmans mass meeting held in Town Hall premises, Chittagong, October 17 :

'This meeting learns with much alarm of the proposed dismemberment of Turkey, and most emphatically protests against such dismemberment.

'This meeting confirms all the resolutions adopted at All-India Muslim Lucknow Conference held on the 21st ult.

'This meeting urges upon the British Premier to represent Indian feelings before the British public and the Peace Conference, and respectfully hopes that British Premier will sign no dismemberment treaty.'

—Beni-Mohan Das, President.

Beg leave to submit following resolutions adopted at Muslim public meeting held in Juma mosque, Chittagong, October 17 :

'This meeting learns with much alarm the proposed dismemberment of Turkey. Most emphatically protests against such dismemberment. This meeting confirms all resolutions adopted at All-India Muslim Lucknow Conference, held 21st ult., regarding Khilafat. This meeting urges upon British Premier to represent Muslim feeling before British public and Peace Conference, and respectfully hopes that British Premier will sign no dismembering treaty.' —Syed Mohamed Serajalhaque Choudhury, President.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, November, 1919.

27

LETTER FROM ALI BROTHERS TO THE CHIEF COMMISIONER, C. P.

Betul, 4 November 1919

As desired by you; we submit as briefly as possible the following points on which we request the early decision of the Governor-General-in-Council—

1. We submit that our detention, which has already lasted 4½ years, has been wholly undeserved, and that we should now be restored to full freedom. We have already submitted, on the 9th July last a very full representation to the Governor-General in Council through you; but no decision thereon has so far been communicated to us. We would not like to repeat the submission made therein; but we may submit that if our detention in jail is punitive, we should be given an open and fair trial by a properly constituted court of law.

If, however, it is not punitive, we submit we should be informed on what event our release depends.

2. If for any reason we are not to be restored to the fullest freedom just yet, we should be transferred to Rampur for the cotton season, after which we may be brought back here, so that we may earn something in the meantime for the maintenance of our families. If we are released later in the year when the cotton season is over, we shall have nothing on which to maintain them.

3. Even if this is not for any reason possible, we should at least be allowed to visit our mother, whose health has broken down, and to remain with her till she gets well. At her time of life—she is 70—and in her present state of mind, the slightest ailment is naturally a source of grave anxiety. We therefore trust immediate permission will be accorded to us to proceed to Rampur.

4. If we are not to be released just yet not to be transferred to Rampur, our families should be permitted to reside at Betul and visit us at convenient intervals.

On account of our business as well as our mother's health, time is a great consideration to us just now. We therefore submit that reference may be made to the Governor-General in Council by wire, and his decision also communicated to us by wire; and in case we are permitted to proceed to Rampur, arrangements may be made here so that our departure is not delayed on account of delay in receiving the necessary sanction for payment of travelling expenses or on any other account.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political B., January, 1920, 493–502.

28

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

6 November 1919

Absence from England has prevented noticing before the comments of your Constantinople correspondent on the signatures to the Muslim memorials submitted to Prime Minister on the Turkish question. As one of those signatories, will you permit me, with your usual courtesy and fairness, to say a few words ?

The illusion that the Muslim feelings in India with regard to Turkev is

unreal must have been dispelled, at least, it is to be hoped, by the weighty pronouncement of Lord Chelmsford in his Council, reported in the 'Times' of September 9. If any further proof was needed as to its reality and intensity, it is furnished by the resolutions which have been and are being adopted after prayers in the mosques and at immense mass meetings in every part of the country against the dismemberment of Turkey and interference with her independence. These resolutions have been transmitted by wire to England for submission to the Prime Minister. They one and all rely on the fulfilment of his memorable pledge. The demand for the independence of the Turkish Sovereign is a natural consequence of the requirements of the Sunni Law relative to the head of the congregation (the Imamal-Kakir, *i. e.*, the Caliph), and the validity of prayers. The law requires a spiritual nexus between the Supreme Imam and the people; that nexus is not established if he is not an independent ruler; and the prayers are consequently invalid.

The Viceroy evidently realises the seriousness of the feeling, otherwise he would have hardly used the words he did in the Council. In these circumstances the signatories to the memorials (whom your correspondent most unwarrantably charges with having associated themselves with 'the professional advocates of Turkey') felt it their duty, as citizens of the British Empire, vitally interested in the pacific development of their people within its vast ambit, to represent the Prime Minister and through his commanding influence and personality to the Peace Conference, the gravity of the situation created by the attempt to go back on his pledge, a pledge of honour, as the Muslims regard it, solemnly given in a grave crisis. The Muslim world is waiting, with a pathetic trust in the honour of England, for the fulfilment of that pledge. Any deviation from it will intensify the prevailing bitterness.

In an allocation addressed to his people, the first Caliph of Islam declared that it was treason to conceal the truth from the Ruler. In that spirit we have worked to discharge our duty to our Sovereign and the Empire, and from the performance of that duty we shall not be deflected by outside attacks.

The reports that have recently appeared in the Paris papers make it perfectly clear that the national consciousness of the Turkish people is now fully aroused; they realise what lies before them. And it seems to be believed, at least in Paris, that they will fight to the death for liberty and the defence of their 'homeland'; they will not submit to the cruel persecution of enemies who have yet to undergo years of pupilage to fit them for governing virile races possessed of long traditions of rulership. The inevitable racial and religious war will keep the Muslim world in a ferment for generations. Apart from the feelings of their Muslim fellow subjects, which deserve some consideration, it may fairly be asked, would the British people, who love liberty for themselves, engage in the repression of the efforts of a sorely afflicted nation to maintain their independence, their national existence, and the sanctity of their hearth and home ? Further, would they be willing to sacrifice the lives of thousands of British soldiers and spend millions of money to satisfy the

ambitions of other nationalities ? Great Britain claims to have liberated Syria and Mesopotamia. Will she not liberate Turkey proper, Thrace, and Constantinople from the greed and earth hunger of other ? If not, we shall only be sowing the proverbial dragon's teeth.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, November, 1919.

29

FATWA BY THE ULEMA REGARDING THE MUSLIM PARTICIPATING IN THE PEACE CELEBRATIONS

What say the Doctors of Muslim theology in regard to the religious permissibility of the participation of Mussulmans in the forthcoming Peace or Victory Celebrations at a time when Peace negotiations with Turkey are still pending, when holy places are in jeopardy, when Jerusalem and Baghdad are in the possession of non-Muslim, when consistent and constant efforts are being made to oust Mussulmans from their possession of Islamia metropolis, Constantinople, and particularly when in view of the above, there is an imminent danger of the power of the Khalifa being materially curtailed and the integrity of harmain shareefain being appreciably impaired, with a further possibility of the latter places passing into non-Muslim possession ?

Source : The Tribune, December, 1919.

30

LETTER FROM SHAIKH M.H. KIDWAI OF GONDIA TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

23 November 1919

Sir, Lord Sydenham is not far wrong in diagnosing the causes of the Muslim unrest in India, although he does not lay due stress upon the chief cause. It is true that uptil 1908 the Muslims of India by a great majority confided their interests completely into the hands of the British officials, and adopted a policy of antagonism to their Hindu brethren. But when they

noticed the change for the worst in the attitude of Great Britain towards Turkey they began to lose confidence in the British people and began to realise that unless they received the sympathy of their Hindu brethren and acquired a respectable self-government position in the world their voice would remain unheard by the British statesmen, notwithstanding the fact that the voice came out of the mouths of 7,20,00,000 British citizens.

The Mussulmans were so much upset by the attitude of Great Britain in the last Balkan and Italian wars against Turkey that their leaders, who were more favourable to the British attitude, lost their positions and popularity. To-day the Hindus are quite dissatisfied with the political situation in India, and the Mussulmans are on the point of exasperation by the intended dismemberment of the Empire of their Khalifa.

I submit that the following scheme should satisfy all the interests : Thrace (Western and Eastern), the whole of Asia Minor (of course, not excluding Smyrna, or other important coastal portions) should form the main State of a united or federated Ottoman Empire, with Constantinople as the capital of constitutional Sultan, the Khalifa of the Muslim world.

To the main State should be united or joined a number of self-government states, either on the lines of the United States of America, the German States, or the British Colonies. The following might be the federated States : (1) Syria, including Palestine; (2) Mesopotamia; (3) Arabia; (4) Armenia; (5) Egypt; (6) Tripoli; (7) Albania; (8) those portions of the Black Sea littoral which have a preponderant Turkish-speaking Muslim population.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, London, December, 1919.

31

THE FIRST ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE

HINDUS MAKE COMMON CAUSE WITH MUSLIMS

8 January 1920

The All India Muslim Conference opened to-day. The Hon. Mr. Fuzlul Haq presided. The conference was not open to the public. Only delegates attended. Mr. M. K. Gandhi was present. Among those who sent telegrams expressing regret at their inability to attend were Sir Dinshaw Petit, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, Mr. Hasan Imam, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. Iswar Saran, and Mr. B. Chakravarti.

Mr. Jinnah sent the following telegram : It is impossible to participate in the peace celebrations while the Punjab cries aloud for redress. We can-

not rejoice in a peace which means the dismemberment of Turkey and which has brought into our lives all the horrors of despotism. Extremely sorry can't attend conference. Wish all success. Thanks for good wishes.

Mr. Baptista wired : Regret my inability to attend conference. Heartily approve abstinence from celebration.

The number of delegates were : Madras 4, U. P. 161, Delhi 40, Rajputana and Sindh 35, Bombay 8, C. P. 6, Bengal 10, Punjab 20. Among those present were the following : Hon. Syed Reza Ali, Mr. Jan Mohammad Chhotani of Bombay, Mr. Harroon of Bombay, Moulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, Moulana Sanaullah of Amritsar, Khan Bahadur Moulana Velayet Hussain of Allahabad, Moulana Fazl-e-Hossain, Hasrat Mohani, Hazik-ul-Mulk Hakim Md. Ajmal Khan, Dr. M. A. Ansari, Mr. Asaf Ali, Barrister-at-law, Delhi, Mr. Zahur Ahmed of Allahabad, Mr. Syed Zahur Ahmed of Lucknow, Moulana Hasan Nizami, the Hon. Mr. Alay Nabi of Agra, Mr. Syud Hosain and the Hon. Moulvi Abdul Kasam, Moulvi Md. Akram Khan, Moulvi Md. Kasem Ali, Moulvis Amiruddin Ahmed, M.A., B. L., Md. Muniruzzaman, Solaiman Khan, Yaqub Ali Chowdhury, Hakim Golam Rasul, and Mujibur Rahman, of Bengal.

The following resolutions were adopted :

1. That this meeting of the representatives of all the Mussulmans of India places on record its profound gratitude to Mahatma Gandhi and other Hindu compatriots who have evinced deep interest in the Khilafat question.

2. That in view of the heart-rending events relative to Turkey Khilafat, the Sacred Places, and Persia, which have been occassioned by a conclusion of peace, this meeting solemnly enjoins upon Indian Muslims scrupulously to refrain from participating in the forth-coming victory celebrations, and further requests all the Khilafat committees and Indian Muslims to render all possible help to the All-Indi Anti-Peace Celebration Committee of Delhi (with Dr. Ansari as its president), whose aims and objects are to widely disseminate the reasons for abstention from the victory carnival.

3. That in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Mussulmans of India still progressively withhold all co-operation from the British Government. This Conference appoints a committee to make a considered suggestion with a view to give practical effect to the above resolution in the event contemplated. and lay the same for final decision before the next session of this conference. Committee : The Hon. Fuzl-ul-Haq, Hazik-ul-Mulk Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abdul Bari, Mr. Syud Hossain, Maulana Sanaullah, Maulana Vilayet Hossain, Khan Bahadur, Maulana Abdul Majid Sharar, the Hon. Raza Ali, Seth Abdullah Haroon, Maulana Fazul-ul-Hasan Hasrat, Mr. Kamaluddin Jafri, and Mr. Mumtaz Hussain, Barrister.

4. That in event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Mahommedans of India are definitely of opinion that to give practical expression to their sense of dissatisfaction a progressive boycott

of British goods should be instituted, and in order to give effect to this decision in the event contemplated this .conference appoints the following committee to make the necessary suggestions which shall be placed before the next session of this conference. Committee : Messrs. Syed Zahur Ahmed, Seth Abdullah Haroon, Haji Ahmad Khattri, Maulana Hasrat, Agha M. Safdar, Maulvi Zafrul Mulk, Maulana Arif Hasvi, Moulvies Akram Khan, Muniruzzaman, Tajuddin, Moulvi Sajjad Bihari.

5. That as early as possible a deputation on behalf of the Mussulmans of India be sent to England with the consent of His Excellency the Viceroy, with the object of laying before the responsible British Ministers and others the true sentiments of Mussulmans with regard to the Turkish and Khilafat questions, and further that the deputation, if necessary, should proceed to the U.S.A., to further the objects of the deputation.

6.. This conference appoints the following gentlemen to form the deputation : The Raja of Mahmudabad, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, the Hon. Fazlul Haq, Dr. Ansari, the Hon. Raza Ali, Syud Hussain, the Hon. Fazli Hussain, Seth Chhotani, Abbas Tyebji, Hasan Imam, Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, Haji Abdullah Karim, the Hon. Abdul Quasim, Mirza Ali Muhammad Khan, Moulvi Abdul Majid Sharar, Moulvi Ibrahim Sialkoti, Muniruzzaman, Moulana Abdul Bari, the Hon. Mr. Sharif, with power to co-opt other members from among the leading Muslims now in England.

THE JOINT CONFERENCE

DELHI, 24 November 1919

The joint session of the All-India Khilafat Conference met this afternoon in the Sungum Theatre. Over a thousand people, including delegates from different provinces, attended. Ladies were present in the gallary. Among the Hindus present were Swami Shraddhanand, Rai Sahib Peary Lall, Mr. Peary Lall, Mr. Madhusudan Dayal, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, and several others.

The Hon. Mr. Fuzlul Haq moved the first resolution, proposing Mr. M. K. Gandhi to be chairman of the meeting. He said the question of the unity of Hindus and Mussulmans was a big one, many problems affecting the two communities would come up for consideration, and one who commanded the confidence of both communities should preside over their deliberation. He knew of no one who fulfilled that condition to a fuller extent than Mahatma Gandhi. (Loud cheers).

Dr. M. A. Ansari, supporting, said there was not a greater commanding personality to-day than Mr. Gandhi, and whose advice would go home to everyone. It was a privilege to have him to preside at such a momentous gathering. The motion was supported by the delegates from other provinces, who all testified to the growing unity of Hindus and Mussulmans and eulogised the services of Mr. Gandhi in bringing about the unity.

Mr. Gandhi was acclaimed chairman, the whole audience standing, the people around him showering flowers on him. Mr. Gandhi addressed the audience in Urdu. The following is a translation of his speech :

'It ought not to appear strange for Hindus to be on the same platform as Mussulmans in a matter like this. All the truest test of friendship is free assistance in adversity, whether we are Hindus, Parsees, Christians or Jews. If we wish to live as one nation surely the interest of any of us must be the interest of all. The only deciding consideration can be the justice of a particular cause. The Prime Minister of England and a whole host of distinguished ex-officials are witnesses to the justice of the Muslim cause. We talk of Hindu-Mahommedan unity. It would be an empty phrase if the Hindus held aloof from the Muslims where the vital interests of the latter were at stake. Some have suggested that we Hindus can assist our Muslim countrymen only on conditions. Conditional assistance is like adulterated cement, which does not bind. The only question therefore is how to help. The Khilafat Conference has come to the decision not to participate in the forthcoming peace celebrations. I think that is a proper decision. Peace celebrations can have no meaning for India when a vital part of the peace, affecting one-fourth of the Indian population, remains undeclared. Eight crores of Mahomedans are deeply interested in the peace terms affecting the Khilafat. It is improper to celebrate peace whilst the fate of the Khilafat hangs in the balance. To ask to celebrate peace whilst the Khilafat question remains unsettled is like expecting France to celebrate peace pending the settlement of Alsace-Lorraine. That Turkey is outside India does not affect the comparison. England is as much a Muslim and Hindu power as it is a Christian Power, and if India be a partner in the Empire, Muslim sentiment deserves as such placating as and any other. It would therefore be most seemly for His Excellency the Viceroy to postpone peace celebration pending a satisfactory settlement of the Khilafat question. It is a question which, indeed, affects the honour of England, the pledges and the word of the Prime Minister. What are riches, power and military renown worth if that honour becomes sullied and the pledge broken ? I was deeply pained to see the telegraphic summary of the Prime Minister's speech, which seemed unnecessarily to wound Muslim susceptibilities and to forecast a settlement of the Khilafat question in contravention of his own solemn word given with due deliberation and at a time when that word steadied Muslim loyalty and, possibly, stimulated recruiting among the warlike Muslim classes. We shall still hope that wiser counsels will prevail and that justice will be done to the Muslims' claim. Should, however, the worst happen, the Khilafat Committee last night decided to advise Mahomedans to withdraw co-operation from the Government. I was privileged to be present at both the subjects committee meetings and the general meetings. I take the liberty of warning the Government of the solemnity of the occassion and the seriousness of the decision, I know that the withdrawal of co-operation is a grave

thing and a big thing. It requires ability to suffer. I know, too, that it is the right of a State when that co-operation means its degradation. It is a tangible form of showing one's displeasure at the acts of one's Government. One may, therefore, hope that the Imperial Government will recognise the gravity of the situation. But from non-cooperation to boycott is a descent from the sublime to the ridiculous. The committee took last night a decision by a majority of votes in favour of a boycott of British goods if the Khilafat question was not satisfactorily settled. Boycott is a form of revenge in order to secure a just solution of the question we have to create a world opinion. I venture to suggest to my Muslim friends that they will not create a world opinion in their favour by proclaiming a boycott of British for other goods, and in practice it is bound to break down. Moreover, the suggested boycott is a confession of weakness. You want strength and not weakness. I therefore hope that the Khilafat Committee will retrace its steps and, after mature consideration, cancel the boycott resolution. In tackling this big question calmness, patience and the strongest adherence to fact are needed. It is not enough that there is no violence. Indeed, violent speeches often are as injurious as a violent deed and I am sure that you will not spoil a cause that is just and sacred by any hasty word or act. It remains for me to examine a position suggested by some friends. It has been contended that the Punjab grievance, too, is good reason for refraining from the peace celebrations. I venture to differ from that view. However grievous the wrong done in the Punjab, it is after all, a domestic affair, and it would show on our part a want of proportion to bring in the Punjab grievance to justify our non-cooperation in an Imperial celebration. The Punjab grievance does not arise out of the peace terms as does the Khilafat question. We must place the Khilafat question separate if we wish to give it its proper place and value. In my humble opinion it is not open to us to refuse to share the celebrations on grounds other than those that arise directly out of the peace, and that touch the vital parts of our national existence. The Khilafat question alone satisfies the two tests.

Hakim Ajmal Khan moved the following resolution :

'This meeting of Muslim and non-Muslim representatives of India, convened to consider the Khilafat question, is of opinion that inasmuch as the Khilafat question, which is part of the peace programme and affects the vital interests of the eight crores of Mussulmans of India, and is therefore a national question, is still unsettled, it is not possible for Indians to participate in the forthcoming celebrations; and, further, respectfully request the Viceroy of India to postpone the celebrations of peace pending a satisfactory and honourable settlement of the Khilafat question.'

Hakim Ajmal Khan, in the course of his speech, said that all Mussulmans, wherever they might live, were brethren and were all connected by the common ties of Khilafat. No doubt it was a communal question. All the religious places were under the Turkish sovereignty. Ever since Turkey joined the

war the Mussulmans were impatient regarding the sovereignty of Turkey and the religious places of Islam. Lord Hardinge gave an assurance of the maintenance of the Turkish sovereignty over the religious places so also did Mr. Lloyd George. President Wilson also gave such an assurance in his fourteen points. But now things were different, and according to the present arrangement the entire Turkish power was being curtailed and the Sultan was being ruduced to the position of the Pope of Rome. Should the Mussulmans join the peace conference ? He asked and said that the real Mussulmans should not join in it and must show to the Government that the Mussulmans were not prepared to see the breaking-up of Islam and therefore could not join in the peace celebrations. They were grateful to the Hindus for joining hands with them.

Swami Shardhanand supported the resolution on the ground that the cause of the Muslims was just. The Hindus joined with them as they were children of the same soil and it was their duty to help the Muslims in their distress. He warned the Hindus that they did not join the Muslims in any spirit of barter....

Mr. Syud Hussain said the day would be ever memorable in the history of India. No Mussulman should join the celebrations until the promises given by the Government were carried out in connection with the Khilafat question.

Mr. S. R. Bomanji of Saharanpur said that, although he belonged to a small community, he was proud to call himself Indian first and Parsee afterwards. It was the duty of every Parsee to join hands with his fellow Hindu and Mussulman brothers. They were all governed by the same laws and the time was past when the division among themselves appealed to the people of India. Assurances were given by the Prime Minister that Turkey will not be divided. He was sure no one would join the celebrations with a clear conscience, and asked his hearers not to be frightened or be afraid to do what they thought to be the supreme duty.

The resolution was further supported by two other speakers.

Mr. Gandhi, in putting it before the conference, said it was not enough that they should simply pass the resolution, but they must refrain from taking any part in the peace celebrations. They should ask their neighbours to do the same, and carry this massage from home to home. They must remember that if people disagreed they should be neither angry nor use pressure of any kind. It would be a purely voluntary effort. The anti-peace celebration committee which had been formed would issue instructions from time to time and educate the people. As far as he was aware there would be illuminations and a distribution of sweets. Parents should see that their children did not take part in them.

The resolution was put to the meeting and accepted, the entire audience standing. At the conclusion of the meeting subscriptions were collected for meeting the expenses of the anti-peace celebrations committee. The whole

proceedings of the conference were conducted in Urdu.—*The Mussulman*, 28 November 1919.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, 8 January 1920.

32

TELEGRAM FROM ABADI BEGUM, THE MOTHER OF MUHAMMED ALI TO VICEROY

27 November 1919

Your petitioner humbly requests that she has been seriously ill for three months and for the last three days fever and stomach trouble has made her exceedingly weak. For God's sake release her sons Shaukat Ali and Mohamed Ali or allow them to come Rampur to see her on her death-bed. If their internment is not terminable intern them at Rampur.

Source: Government of India, Home Department Political B, January 1920, 493-502.

33

TELEGRAM FROM SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE VICEROY

26 December 1919

It is proposed by Hon'ble Home Member, with his Excellency's approval, to extend benefit of amnesty to Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali. He considers that this is desirable in order to placate Mahommedan feeling which would be irritated by their exclusion as contrasted with indulgence shown to Punjab and other political offenders. Proposal has the concurrence of all Hon'ble Members present in Delhi. Kindly wire reply.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political B. Proceedings, January 1920, 493-502.

34

TELEGRAM FROM CHIEF COMMISSIONER CENTRAL PROVINCES TO THE SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

29 December 1919

Ali brothers were released 28th morning from Betul and were paid expenses for journey to Rampur.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political B, January 1920, 493-502.

35

ADDRESS PRESENTED TO LLOYD GEORGE, THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND, BY SOME PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN ON THE SUBJECT OF TURKISH SOVEREIGNTY IN ASIA MINOR AND THRACE

We are reluctant to add to your many preoccupations at the present time, but, in view of the momentous interests involved, we think it our duty to put before you as clearly as we can the feelings which Mahommedans all over the Empire entertain for Turkey, and to warn you of the great danger of disregarding those sentiments. We fear that you have not had adequately presented to you the indignation and resentment with which Mahommedan hear of proposals to drive the Turk out of Europe, to deprive him of his Capital and to divide Asia Minor among the Allies. We believe that those parts of Turkey which are inhabited by Turks cannot be put under alien rule without sowing the seeds of grave peril to the Empire. It is this consideration which compels us to sound before it is too late a most serious note to warning.

All Muslims of the Empire have an intense sympathy and affection for the Sultan of Turkey. This feeling is no doubt partly religious, because a considerable majority of them consider him the Caliph or Successor of the Prophet, and believe that he in that capacity is the spiritual head of their faith. But the feeling of sympathy with Turkey is shared by those Mahommedans who do not acknowledge the spiritual authority of the Sultan, and it is because attachment to Turkey is so widespread among all the sects of Mahommedanism that we think it deserves your special attention. There is,

to put the case very briefly, a certain community of feeling throughout the Islamic peoples. They feel themselves to be heirs of a common civilisation, to have certain customs and ideals in common and to be in fact a social entity. They have for Islam a quasi-patriotic devotion and they are filled with horror at the idea that it should altogether cease to be an effective force in temporal matters. The Turkish Empire is now the only survivor of those numerous Mahommedan kingdoms which once stretched in a continuous chain from China to the Atlantic; Mahommedan sympathy has been concentrated upon that Empire as the last representative of the temporal power of their people. If Turkey disappears from the map the last independent kingdom left to the Mahommedans will have gone and they will look upon its downfall as symbolic of the downfall of Islam.

England is a great Asiatic Power, and her policy must for that reason take account of one of the strongest sentiments in Asia, viz., attachment to Islam. We recognise unreservedly that our own principles must at times compel us to take action which will be highly unpopular with the Mahommedan masses. We fully realise that it will be necessary to free the Armanians from Turkish misrule and to give scope for Arab aspirations, but on the other hand we urge that British policy should not be deflected by extreme religious or ethical views in this country, or be led by natural indignation at the excesses of certain sections of Mahommedans to pursue a course which will give to a great community just reason for resentment. Our policy should be one that can be defended upon the principles to which we have ourselves appealed during the war, and to which educated Mahommedans must assent. These principles will be violated if countries such as Thrace and Asia Minor, which are preponderantly Turkish, are put under European domination. This will not only be a grave injustice, but a great political blunder. These countries, placed against their will under alien rule, will become a centre of disturbances as troublesome to the peace of Asia as the Balkans have been to the peace of Europe. Every riot in the bazar at Smyrna, every collision at Koniah between the Turkish population and a European gendarme will start a wave of angry unrest in Muslim countries which will eventually break upon a British frontier, either Indian or Egyptian. As an Asiatic Power we want the goodwill of the Mahommedans;by the destruction of Turkish sovereignty in those countries we should inevitably forfeit it.

We fell a particular concern with regard to India. The loss of Mahommedan confidence in British justice would be a disaster. The Mahommedans are the most compact and virile community in India; hitherto they have formed a moderate party, favourable, on the whole, to the British connection and to the present form of government. In spite of their sympathy for the Turk they have remained staunchly loyal to their allegiance throughout the war. Mahommedan soldiers fought for us in Mesopotamia and Palestine. According to the tenets of their faith it was their clear duty so to do, but none the the less it placed a strain upon their loyalty which it would be ungenerous to

ignore. We believe that not only the soldiers but the whole Mahommedan community in India were much relieved and encouraged by your speech of 5 January 1918, in which you declared, 'We are not fighting to deprive Turkey of its Capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race.' The declaration is now widely known in India, and there is little probability of its being forgotten. If you are unable to persuade the Powers at the Peace Conference to fulfil the pledge then given we fear that the Mahommedans will consider it a breach of faith for which they will hold England responsible. No Indian administrator can contemplate this possibility with equanimity. Hitherto we have had a reputation for good faith in India which has been one of the most valuable assets of the Empire. We cannot hope to retain it if we fail to keep our word upon a subject like this.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, 4 December 1919.

36

MEMORIAL TO THE PRIME MINISTER BY THE KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

12 December 1919

1. In view of the ferment and general unrest prevailing among the Muslim nations all over the world, we, the undersigned British and British Indian subjects of His Majesty, feel it our duty to urge respectfully on His Majesty's Government the imperative necessity of a policy towards Turkey that would lead to appeasement. This ferment, which in some parts has taken a violent form of expression, is mainly due to the universal apprehension that it is proposed to further dismember the Turkish Empire and to completely destroy the free life and political power of the few remaining Muslim States.

2. Although we are not afraid at present of any untoward consequences we are convinced that the perpetuation of the existing bitterness among our Muslim fellow-subjects in India would seriously retard the peaceful progress and development of the country. And it is for this reason that the efforts of the Indian Mahommedans to urge upon His Majesty's Government the fulfilment, Sir, of your memorable pledge (of January 1918) have met with so much sympathy among the Hindu community.

3. The three causes which have primarily created the apprehension and ferment referred to in the preceding paragraph are, firstly, the belief that in

violation of the pledges which secured the adhesion of Islamic peoples to the Allies in the world-war, it is proposed to sever from Turkey provinces and districts preponderantly inhabited by the Turkish people; secondly, that it is intended to impose a suzerainty (by whatever name it may be called) over the Turkish Sovereign which would fundamentally affect his status and prestige as the religious and spiritual head of the largest portion of the Islamic world; and thirdly, that it is designed, as is suggested in the Press, to retain the protectorate of the Sacred Cities of Islam in non-Muslim hands, which would be in absolute conflict with the religious laws of the Muslims.

4. In our opinion, it is perfectly possible for His Majesty's Government to meet on all these points the wishes, and to remove the apprehensions, of the King's Muslim subjects, and thus bring about appeasement and create afresh the old stedfastness without detracting in smallest degree from its power, prestige, or authority, or militating against the main objects of the Allies.

5. With regard to the first ground of complaint, we beg to make the following remarks : Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine are proposed to be detached from the Turkish Empire on the ground that they are preponderantly inhabited by non-Turkish Muslims intermixed with other communities. This expropriation is proposed with the avowed object of giving the people of those provinces applied to Hijaz, and the Sherif of Macca has been made the King of that part of Arabia which acknowledged allegiance to the Turkish State.

6. But none of these considerations apply to Asia Minor (Turkey proper), extending from the Agean Sea to the confines of Persian Kurdistan, or to Thrace (the Vilayet of Adrianople), or to Constantinople. The question under reference has, it is respectfully submitted, been confused by fallacious arguments and still more fallacious figures. An impartial inquiry by an Allied Commission would incontestably prove the correctness of our assertions, which are based on the official statistics for the year 1914, anterior to the war and long before there could be any reason to manufacture or manipulate figures. In that year the population of Constantinople, leaving out odd numbers, stood, according to nationality and faith as follows :

Muslims, 5,60.000; Greeks, 2,05,000; Armenians, 82,000.

We believe no appreciable variation has taken place since.

In the Vilayat of Adrianople the population stood as follows :

Muslims, 5,60,000, Greeks, 2,24,000; Armenians, 19,000.

In the Sandjak of the Dardanelles :

Muslims, 1,49,000; Greeks, 8,000; Armenians, 2,000.

Asia Minor, speaking subject to correction, consists of 29 Vilayets of which Smyrna of Aidin, with the port of Smyrna on the Agean, is the most important.

In this Vilayet the population numbered as follows :

Muslims, 12,49,000; Greeks, 2,99,000; Armenians, 20,000.

We have learnt with horror from credible sources that since the Greek invasion nearly 10,000 Muslims have been killed, large numbers are missing, and over 1,00,000 are homeless refugees.

7. In the face of the above facts we can hardly bring ourselves to believe that His Majesty's Government or the Supreme Council would be disposed to tear any part of these territories away from the Turkish nation, to whom they belong, not merely by ties of race and religion but also from the fact that Muslims form the preponderant element in the population. Even in the Eastern Districts the unifying effects of a common faith, common ideals, and common religious traditions have produced between Muslims of different stocks a solidarity the strength of which it would be rash to underestimate.

8. We beg respectfully to submit that the attempt to sever these districts from Turkey would conflict with all the basic principles on which the Allies and Associated Powers have rested the righteousness of their cause and it would be an outrage on humanity and every principle to justice. The utmost the minority is entitled to ask is equal rights and protection against injustice and wrong, and that object, in our opinion, can be more fully assured by other and wiser methods. A violent disruption of the existing status, or the forcible expatriation of the vast majority of Muslims, would inevitably lead to trouble, the end of which cannot be foreseen and would intensify the present ferment and keep it alive for generations.

9. With regard to the idea of imposing a 'mandate' on Turkey, in plainer words, placing her under the suzerainty of some foreign Power, the signatories to this memorial consider that it would be a deliberate and gratuitous insult to Muslim religious feeling, the result of which would be disastrously mischievous to the interests of our Empire, as it would permanently alienate from us our Muslim fellow-subjects. The object in view, in our opinion, can be fully obtained by adopting a magnanimcus policy towards Turkey. If the policy towards her on the present occasion is magnanimous and untinged by any suspicion of vindictiveness, we believe that Turkey would renew her application for the services of competent Englishmen, which England refused before in deference to the wishes of the late Czars' Government. The influence of the British Ambassador in Constantinople, combined with that of European and American specialists, whose services we believe would, after a just and equitable peace, be freely invoked by the Turkish Government in the work of resuscitation and the reorganisation of their country, would be sure guarantee for peaceful consolidation.

10. Regarding Mecca and Medina, we consider that it would be most unwise and highly detrimental to the interests of our world-wide Empire to

claim or to exercise, directly or indirectly, a protectorate over them. We venture to suggest that while the administration of these Sacred Cities might be left in the charge of the autonomous Government if Hijaz, in order to legitimate the position of its ruler in the eyes of the vast Sunni population of the world, he should receive, as the representative of their spiritual head, his investiture from the Caliph-Sultan.

11. Finally, we desire to express our conviction that in view of the fact that England holds in her hand the destinies of vast millions of people in Asia, and, since the war ended, has taken charge of many more million, it behoves her not to overlook the dangers that threaten and have always threatened her dominancy from the North. Whether Russia and the great territories she claims in Asia are Bolshevist or Czarist, we consider that the danger will always be the same. We believe that the existence of a strong Turkey would form a barrier against this ever present danger, the value of which it would be the greatest mistake to overlook.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

37

CABLEGRAMS SENT FROM FAZLUL HAQ, PRESIDENT ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE TO MR. M. H. ISPAHANI

19, December 1919.

The first session of the All-India Khilafat Conference, attended by nearly three hundred representatives of the Khilafat Committees from Bengal, Madras, Bombay, United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces, Sindh, Rajputana, Punjab, and Delhi, fully representing the Legislative Councils, and especially theological and mercantile sections of Muslim population, and otherwise supported by entire body of Indian Muslims, was held on November 23 at Delhi when the following resolutions were passed : (1) It was resolved that, having regard to the heartrending consequences of conclusion of peace affecting Turkey, Khilafat, Holy Places, and Persia, this meeting enjoins it upon Indian Muslims as a religious duty to abstain from participation in the forthcoming victory celebrations and further to give effect to above resolve, requests all Khilafat Committees and Mussulmans generally to render all possible help to Anti-Peace Celebration Committee, Delhi, constituted with object of giving wide publicity to reasons for which abstention from peace celebration is enjoined. (2) That in the event of settlement with Turkey not being concluded to satisfaction of Mussulmans, it is

the definite opinion of Indian Muslims that their dissatisfaction should assume practical form of a progressive boycott of British goods. A Committee was formed to make suggestions regarding practical initial steps. (3) That on the above contingency coming to pass, Indian Muslims should initiate a gradual cessation of co-operation with the Government, and a responsible Committee has been appointed to make considered recommendations regarding the practical adoption of the principle. (4) Finally, the meeting resolved that a deputation consisting of Raja Mahmudabad, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, the Honourable Fazul Haq, Dr. Ansari, Seth Chhotani, the Honourable Fazal Husain, Honourable Raza Ali, Syud Husain, Sir Fazalbhoy Karimbhoy, Mr. Syed Hasan Imam, Honourable Abdul Qasim, Honourable Shareef ji Deoji, Seth Abdulla Haroon, Mirza Ali Mohammed Khan, Moulvi Sharar, Maulana Abdul Bari, Moulvi Ibrahim, with power to add to their number, should as soon as possible proceed to England, and, if necessary, to the United States, with the consent of H. E. Viceroy, to lay the true sentiments of Mussulmans before responsible British Ministers. On November 24 a joint meeting of Muslim and Non-Muslim representatives of India was held, at the same place, Mr. Gandhi presiding when the following resolutions were unanimously passed : That this meeting of Muslim and non-Muslim representatives of India convened to consider the Khilafat question is of opinion that inasmuch as the Khilafat question which is part of the peace programmes and affects the vital interest of eighty million Mussulmans of India, and is, therefore, a national question, is still unsettled, it is not possible for Indians to participate in the forthcoming peace celebrations; and further respectfully requests His Excellency the Viceroy of India to postpone the celebration of peace pending a satisfactory and honourable settlement of the Khilafat question. In view of America's attitude, Indian Muslims feel that Great Britain will have a decisive voice in the settlement of peace terms with Turkey; the sacrifice in men and money made by Muslims and their achievement in late war entitle them to a determining voice in the final settlement with Turkey. Prime Minister's Sheffield and Guildhall speeches have caused intense anguish and horror. The Muslims expected Great Britain to redeem her word of honour, pledged more than once by responsible Ministers and representatives of the House of Commons, nor have they yet abandoned their hope. The fulfilment of these pledges will, in their opinion, constitute the test of British sincerity. Muslim India expects these pledges will not be violated under pressure of selfish interests, and that the principles of nationality and self-determination forming basis of peace terms with all the belligerents, will be observed in the case of Turkey. Finally, they trust no occasion will arise for carrying out their resolution 2 and 3 of November 23, but you will be best interpreter of Muslim wishes and bring about an honourable peace for Turkey on the terms aforesaid.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, December, 1919.

38

TELEGRAM FROM THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER, CENTRAL PROVINCES

27 December 1919

Government of India have decided that benefit of amnesty should be extended to Mohamed and Shaukat Ali and that they should now be released. Governor-General in Council accordingly cancels warrants under Regulation III issued against them. Please return these to Government of India after releasing brothers as soon as possible. Addressed Central Provinces repeated to the United Provinces, Bengal, Bombay, and Punjab.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political B, January 1920, 493-502.

39

LETTER FROM SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

24 December 1919

I thank you for the letter you have sent while returning my MSS. You have been so kind as to offer me the hospitality of your columns often and upon different topics, that I feel I owe you an explanation as to the letter I sent last for publications and which you have returned with you regrets.

I assure you that what I related were facts, not 'threats'. Muslims fully realise that at the present moment Europe and Christendom possess almost complete military supremacy, and what has happened in Egypt and India has left no doubt in their minds that materialist and sentimentless Europe has no scruples in using the destructive machines it has invented in ruthlessly butchering those who are weak and defenceless. So there can be no question of 'threat' on the part of the Muslims and other non-Christians. From a military point of view Muslims are courting slaughter and death by their restlessness. But as in the East sentiments are not dead yet, we cannnot help being restless. That there is a certain danger of being slaughtered does not mean that the Muslims shall or should become indifferent to

the foul deed which Europe is ready to perform of condemning a whole nation with a brilliant past to death, a glorious Empire to destruction, and a heroic religion, a marvellous and living, pious and non-mercenary, non-materialistic and unselfish civilisation, a democratic and liberal constitution to an abject and servile position. There are occasions when death is sweeter than life.

The Muslim nation is being forced by the attitude of a group of Christian Powers in which Great Britian has a dominating voice, either to keep quite and see the most malicious humiliation of Islam and the deliberate violation of its constitution, or to face annihilation at the hands of remorseless Christian Europe. What should they choose ? I leave it to every honourable man to decide for himself.

Islam is no jumble of dogmas. It offers no mathematical puzzles. It does not vouchsafe salvation by a mere belief. It is a civilisation, a constitution, a code of life by which one-third population of the earth conducts its daily, nay, hourly existence. The Constitution of Islam needs an *Independent* Khilafat (successor of the Holy Prophet of Islam who was himself a ruling sovereign, a constitutional monarch).

In a debate in the House of Lords on April 20, 1915, Lord Cromer, who knew something of the Constitution of Islam, said : 'I think we might go so far as to give them (Muslims) some sort of assurance that we recognise that the Caliph should be not only a Muslim of such position as to be independent of any European pressure of any kind or sort', and in the same debate Lord Crewe, on behalf of the Government, gave the following pledge : 'It is not for us, I will not say to attempt to impose a Caliph on the Muslim world, but even to bring about by forcible means a situation which would in practice compel the choice to fall on a particular individiual.' When the war was on, the British Government issued proclamations that 'no religious question whatever was involved in the war', that the Holy Place of Islam will be 'immune from attack and molestation', that no member of the Allied Powers had any 'territorial greed or ambition'. It was assurances like these that induced Indians to give up their lives, money, and labour to obtain victory for the Allied cause generally and mainly against Turkey. No Muslim would have fought against the Turks if he had dreamt that victory would mean the expulsion of the Crescent from Europe and the disruption of the Empire of his Khalifa to satisfy the earth-hunger and the lust for exploitation of England and France and even Italy and Greece. Take any standard of right and justice and it will be impossible to find any justification for destroying only non-Christian Empire in Europe simply because it has met a military defeat.

Thrace, both Eastern and Western, the whole of Asia Minor, are predominantly Muslim. They are admittedly (Mr. Lloyd George himself admitted it on January 5, 1918) the 'homelands' of the Turks. Constantinople has been the capital of the Muslims Empire for the last four centuries. Now, why on

earth should any of these places be taken from the Turks ? Even the savage right of the sword cannot be alleged against any of these places, because not an inch of them was conquered by the sword of the Allies.

After what happened in Egypt and India I hope no Englishman will dare to whisper the word of 'massacre'. And can any other European nation whisper it ? Why should the Turks be expelled from their capital and homelands if a few of their administrators somewhere in an extensive Empire committed excesses on a notoriously rebellious people when they were involved in a life-and-death struggle, while the Greeks, Servians, Armenians, Russians, Bulgarians, and all others whose hands are red with the blood of thousands and thousands of human beings (no doubt Muslims and Jews, nevertheless human) are patted on the back ?

Not only Servia, but even Bulgaria is receiving favours at the hands of British statesmen, and murderous Greece, which has just recently slaughtered Muslim men, women, and children in Smyrna, is allowed to dictate the terms of an atrocious peace to Turkey, and British statesmen are inclined to attend more to what Venizelos demands than to what 315 millions of people in India, through whom victory against the Turks was achieved submit.

Why ? Is is not simply because the Turks are Muslims and belong to a race and civilisation which is considered alien to other European races ? Why, then, should not this religious fanaticism, this racial hatred, find an echo in India and in Egypt and Afghanistan and Central Asia, etc. ? You, Sir, take the restlessness of the Muslim world to be a 'threat'. What would you say if a man or a nation, well armed and powerful, were deliberately to goad a weak man or nation, without any arms, to desperation, knowing that the latter will find it impossible to keep quiet under the provocation, and thus the former will get an excuse to slaughter the latter ? Would you call it a 'threat' if the strong man was informed by the weaker that such-and-such act of the former will most likely drive the latter to desperation ? Exactly the same is the situation now. An expulsion of the Crescent from Europe, a humiliation of Islam, a disruption of the only non-Christian Empire in Europe, are certain to drive the Muslim nation to desperation. Those who have eyes to see can read the signs of that desperation in India and Egypt and elsewhere. Will it not be the most horrible barbarism conceived of if Great Britain, confident of its military power to crush all the millions upon millions of weak people, were knowingly and deliberately to ignore these signs as vain 'threat' and to persist in taking such steps that are most likely to increase exasperation ?'

Kindly see the situation as I have put it and then let me know if I was justified in relating the ominous signs of exasperation on the part of the Muslims, which would no doubt lead to their suffering, yet would cause some loss-say, of a few bombs and cartridges to the British nation also.

I certainly do not believe that statesmenship is bankrupt or that the world would crumble to pieces if the banner of Islam was not torn to shreds and the Khalifa sent 'bag and baggage' out of Europe. I certainly see more harm

than good to the British Empire, British peace, British commerce, by the adoption of a militarist policy against Islam. The example of Germany itself teaches us that, after all, one cannot depend much upon military perfection. There is an Almighty Power above all kings and nations.

The future for us is black nay, clearly dangerous, but the very life of our Holy Prophet had seen much darker, much more dangerous situations. The fanaticism of the European Powers is solidifying more and more the unity not only of Muslims, but of all non-Europeans, In India the Hindus and Muslims have become one; in Egypt the Muslims and Copts. Even in Mesopotamia the Turks and Arabs are joining hands. The Afghanistanis are exchanging greetings of friendship with Bolshevists. And against whom ? Is England going to be the common enemy ? Will that be a very honourable or enviable position ?

Please excuse this draft on your valuable time, but kindly believe it that it is only because I have respect for your paper that I have taken the trouble to enter into such a lengthy explanation.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

40

RELEASE AND THE RECEPTION OF THE ALI BROTHERS

In contrast to the Sinha-reception, a glowing episode in the political history of this period was the grand public reception which followed in the trail of the famous Ali Brothers and the Punjab leaders, since released under the Royal Amnesty of 1919, as they toured throughout Northern India in a march of triumphal procession. Lahore, Amritsar, and other places of the Punjab were the scenes of the wildest enthusiasm over the return back to their homes of those martyred heroes who had braved th Martial Law frightfulness of that infamous O'Dwyerian regime of the Punjab of 1919, and of these the most abiding are the historic reception of the Ali Brothers at Delhi and of the Punjab Leaders at Calcutta.

Early in January 1920 Delhi citizens made preparations for the reception of their beloved leåders in a scale hitherto unparaleled. Triumphal arches, artistic decorations, festoons, banners, buntings, draperies of silk and hangings of carpet, mottos in scarlet and gold and flags of the silver crescent were lavished in profusion throughout the main streets, from the shops in the ground floor to the house tops. Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Muhammad Ali arrived on January 9th and were received at the station by a crowd estimated

at 2 lakhs. A long ring of cheers, winding and reverberating through the streets, chawks and the narrow lanes of Delhi, which has never been heard or witnessed within its ramparts since the beginning of British rule in India, gave a sombre impression to the scene. So tense was popular feeling on the occasion that Government thought it fit to withdraw the military and the armed police from the place and for two days the town was given into the hands of the Ali Brothers and the populace. Dr. Ansari read the most touching message of welcome and Maulana Hasan Nizami read the following address on behalf of the citizens of Delhi and presented it in two separate silver caskets to the two brothers amidst thundering peals of applause.

The most significant incident of the day came when Lala Shanker Lal and Shiva Narain, the Home Rule Heroes of Delhi, were presented to the Ali Brothers. Standing on the raised platform and facing the huge audience, for a moment stilled as if by a spell, the great Moslem leaders clasped their Hindu brethren in their arms and kissed each other. Up rose from the sea of human heads a tumultuous roar of enthusiasm and for a time, Hindus and Moslems gave themselves up to an orgy of mutual embraces. Several purses of Gold and garlands studded with gold Mohure were then presented to the Ali Brothers.

The following is the translation of the address presented to the Ali Brothers :

'Honoured patriots, devoted servants of Islam, it is nearly five years when your long internment with all sufferings and trials commenced, when we, the citizens of Delhi, entrusted you to the care of God. Let us first bend our knee for grateful contemplation to the Protector who has guarded you against the tide of reactionary excesses forming the order of the day, who has granted it to the citizens of Delhi and the Muslims of India to-day to avail themselves of your sincere guidance and regard of matters spiritual and secular affecting their struggle for national existence. The people of Delhi have special occasion to congratulate themselves on your restoration to liberty, because you were almost the first who undertook the task of dispelling the sombre silence which had befallen Delhi following the downfall of the Moghul power. It would be ingratitude on the part of the citizens of Delhi to forget that it was due to your efforts that Delhi began to meet. We cannot forget yours was the first voice to awaken the slumbering masses of Delhi and a debt of gratitude under which you have allied us is one which we can scarcely hope to repay. The unmistakable signs of the Hindu Muslim unity and especially of the resuscitation of the Muslim Community observable in India to day also bear witness to your invaluable services, and your worst enemy cannot attempt to deny you the honoured place in the list of the patriotic workers who are rearing magnificent temple of human prosperity on bedrock of freedom and the rights of man. It would require a volume to enumerate in detail your services regarding the M.A.O. College, Muslim University, galvanizing the Mumssli community of India through your brilliant newspapers 'Comrade'

and 'Hamdard' (upon which descended the ever-hateful sword of Democles, 'the Press Act)', raising funds for the Muslim victims of the Balkan war, organizing competent, well equipped medical mission for the Turkish wounded, enlightening non-Muslims regarding that the sanctity of mosques (which was preceded by the heartless massacre of some faithful Muslims at Cawnpore) not to mention the organisation of Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba and its admirable work to bring about the alleviation and hardships of Hijaz Pilgrims and the valuable services regarding the Muslim League. Your co-religionists, and compatriots fully value all your services, but there emerges from your political, and religious life one principle which claims the highest eminence and has been to us all as a lustrous ideal to achieve. It is none other than the example you have set us in firmness, fearlessness in telling the truth, from resolve, illustrations of indomitable will according to Quaranic text which says 'neither are they daunted nor are they unhappy.' Indeed it is example fit to adorn pages of history in letters of gold to light the path for our coming generation to the ultimate goal. It makes clear as noon day that faith, determination, sincerity are the three mates which distinguish the true followers of the Prophet of Arabia. You set before your community and country an example of pure, selfless, genuine patriotism which very largely contributed to the deepening of shallow faith, invigoration of fainting heart and steadying of faltering steps. Five years ago there were not many in India who had the courage or conviction to declare openly the commandments of the law of God regarding the question of Khilafat and the holy places, but to-day every house top is resounding with open declaration with those very tenets. It is due to you, with which you have presented your community in your own life, that the Mussulmans are determined today to make every possible sacrifice for the sake of righteousness and faith. Dear patriots, your restoration to liberty is a matter of profound rejoicing to us, because we have, at this supreme crisis when Muslim world is involved in the life and death struggle and India has been the unfortunate victim to naked coercion and appalling repression, the privilege of benefitting by your sincere guidance. Your presence in our midst will stimulate our community into solidarity seriously imperilled during the last five years of agonizing ordeals. The foundation stone of the Hindu Muslim unity has already been laid upon which is now rising the superb monument of the united nation. Your participation in its up-building will greatly contribute to the acceleration of our activity. Delhi or her hoary memories has been scene of many royal arrival and departure. Princes and high placed functionaries have graced this city with their presence, and it has seen many gorgeous procession, royal pageant and has discharged the duty of welcoming the great personages, but if love and regard with which our welcome to you is inspired are to be a measure of spontaneity, and genuineness, rarely has similar welcome been extended to others. It is not customary compliance with the usual conventions that our words of welcome aim at, on the contrary, it is humble and inadequate tribute

of love. Nothing can be more sincere effort on our part to fully appraise the lesson of your life which has imparted us than try to approximate it in our daily life. Let us therefore assure you that our real welcome to you consists in the affirmation that our anchor holds.'

THE CALCUTTA RECEPTION

Meanwhile the Ali Brothers were organising a deputation to the Viceroy on the Khilafat question and were moving about in the cause of the Khilafat. By the middle of February public activity in the country centred round the second Khilafat Conference. The Ali Brothers accompanied by some of the Punjab leaders. They arrived at Calcutta on 22nd February by special train. The unprecedented demonstration displayed by the public surpassed all similar demonstrations in enthusiam and ardour, for Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Marwaris, Bhatias and all joined hands. A long procession was organised from the Howrah station to a mammoth pandal erected on the Halliday Street. Floral gates and arches were erected at the interval of a few paces, and at places there were handstands with naubats and other Indian music. In front of the Marwari Association on Harrison Road, a floral arch was erected in the centre of which was placed a large sized picture of Mahomed Ali, Shaukat Ali, and their revered mother. This was significant of the fusion of Hindu-Moslem interest, as not very long ago an unremitting feud used to exist between the Marwaris of Barrabazar and the Moslems of the neighbourhood. Tens of thousands of people of all shades lined the route of procession and assembled at the pandal where mustered all the great Congress men of Calcutta and Bengal while the moderates shunned it to a man. Mr. B. Chakravarti, the president, then presented the following address on behalf of the Citizens of Calcutta :

With love and greeting to :

Mr. Shaukat Ali	Mr. Satyapal
Lala Harkishan Lal	Mr. A. K. Azad
Mr. Duni Chand	Mr. Narayandas Khanna
Dr. Kitchlew	Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhury.

'On behalf of the citizens of Calcutta, we beg to offer you a greeting of cordial and brotherly welcome.

'We have nothing to offer you in the shape of rank, riches or honours nor do you come among us clad in office, authority or power. The bond between you and ourselves is not one of material give and take, of favours bestowed and received, of rewards given or expected it is one of common hopes and aspirations, of a common love and service, and, may we add, of a common liability to suffer and endure.'

'You, each of you, in your separate, for short or for long, according to the tale of your years, have suffered and laboured in the cause of your country. Some of you, in humble and retired walks of life, toiled for the

redumption of your suffering fellow bretheren; others, called by fortune to rank among the great ones of the earth have proved their faith when so many were false. But, gentle or simple, ye all were stedfast in the hour of danger. and the Almighty has set his crown upon your work by giving you the high and cherished privilege of suffering for your country. You were faithful in the few things of life and so in the fulness of time, God chose you out to be faithful in many. He set you up as on a pedestal of trial agony; and our hearts glow with fervent admiration as we think of the courage, endurance and patient heroism with which you bore up under the heavy burden of high-handed iniquity.

'You emerge from your tribulations like gold thrice-tested in fire : the stamps of the Almighty's grasp is upon you and your work : ye are as chosen instruments in the hands of your Maker, fashioned and welded by suffering to work out his purposes in the large and beneficent economy of the universe. Ye have laboured and ye have endured, what more do we except of frail humanity ?

'After long periods of suffering and detention ye have been permitted to regain your freedom and to return to your normal places in life; but there are others to whom the blessing of liberty is still denied. To us in Bengal, this thought comes with a sense of keen and poignant sorrow, for we cannot forget that numbers of our young men are still spending weary days and hours– some in the far Andamans, and some in the jails of Bengal, many amid circumstances of grievous and intolerable hardship. And as we have our portion of suffering in Bengal, so have you in the Punjab, so have you in Maharashtra and so in other parts of the country. The same tale comes from everywhere and inspite of the King's gracious message there is desolation at many hearths in the land. For all such brothers, privileged to suffer for their motherland, our only prayer on this auspicious occasion shall be, 'May they be strong and patient in their suffering even as ye were strong and patient in your.'

We have the honour to remain,
Your grateful and admiring fellow country-men,
The Citizens of Calcutta.

For the next few days Hindus, Moslems and Marwaris of Calcutta gave themselves up in offering receptions and banquets in honour of their guests. The student population of Calcutta met them on the 27th February and presented the following address :

'When clouds of gloom and despair were gathering on the political horizon, you stood up fearlessly to champion the just cause of our country-men, and the sufferings of the martyrs were your lot. But by the grace of God and through the clemency of His Majesty the King-Emperor you have been restored to us. Your sufferings have not only roused up in you a stronger determination to devote yourselves wholly to the cause of our

Motherland but have been instrumental in bringing about the dawn of a new era in our national life. The Hindu Moslem unity has been one of the direct results. Nor have you sufferings been lost upon us. The heroic example of your noble and silent self-sacrifice has inspired us with a burning desire to follow in your wake and to serve our Motherland.

'Beloved leaders, standing on the dawn of a new era, we are beholding the vision of a glorious future. Throbbing with the pulse of a new life, our young spirit is seeking to realise itself through the service of the Motherland. At the most impressionable stage of our life we look up to you for direction and guidance so that we may follow the path of truth and justice only, rise above all party spirit and mean hatred, and learn to suffer with strong and silent determination.'

'Dear leaders, while we are deeply thankful to God for your return, our heart goes out in sympathy to those of our brethren who have not been yet released. We hope and trust that fullest use of the Royal Clemency will be made and thus help the birth of a new spirit of trust and fellowship.

'May God give us the same power of patience and fortitude, love and faith, which sustained you in your hours of trouble, and may His blessings and your benedictions be upon us in our determination to serve our Motherland and to fight for truth and justice fearlessly, however strong the forces in opposition be.

'May God spare you to us for years to come and give you strength and light to serve God, humanity and the Motherland, is the earnest prayer of

Your Admirers
The Students of Calcutta.'

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1921.**

41

ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, AMRITSAR

31 December 1919

The second session of the All India Khilafat Conference opened on the 31 December 1919 in the Congress Pandal at Amritsar.

Maulvi Shaukat Ali, the great Muslim internee who was released only on the 30th December presided. Mahatma Gandhi, Swami Shraddhanand, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb, Mrs. Besant, Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Mohamed Ali, Dr. Ansari, Haziq-ul-Mulk Hakim Ajmal Khan, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Saiyed

Hussain, Dr. Kitchlew and Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhury and others were present. The proceedings began with a recitation from the holy Quran The following resolutions were passed :

RESOLUTION I

This meeting of the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Amritsar expresses on behalf of the Indian Mussulmans its profound devotion to the Commander of the Faithful, the successor to the holy prophet of the Islam may peace and blessing of God be upon him, the servant of the holy places, the Sultan of Turkey; may his temporal and spiritual power last for ever, and hopes that his Imperial Majesty will deign to accept the expression of their faith and allegiance : This conference further requests its president to cable the message of the Indian Mussulmans to his Imperial Majesty.

The resolution was moved by Seth Ahmed Haji Siddiqi Khatri supported by Moulana Mohamed Kakhir of Allahabad.

RESOLUTION II

Resolved that in accordance with the decisions of the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Delhi two representative deputations of the Mussulmans should proceed to England and America before 15th January or at the latest by the end of January and that H.E. the Viceroy be requested as early as possible to accord permission to the deputation and to forward to His Majesty the King Emperor and his Ministers by cablegram the request that the deputations be received by them and also to intimate their departure.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Saiyed Hussain and supported by Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew.

RESOLUTION III

Resolved that a deputation consisting of the following Muslim representatives of India should immediately wait upon H. E. the Viceroy in order to obtain his permission for the deputations to proceed to England and America and that the president of the conference be requested to ascertain the date that will suit His Excellency's convenience for receiving the deputation : Seth Chhotani Sahib, Sir Fazulbhoy Carimbhoy, Mirza Ali, Mohamed Khan, Haziq-ul-Mulk H. M. Ajmal Khan, Dr. M. A. Ansari, Mr. Mohamed Ali, Mr. Shaukat Ali, Mr. Mumtaz Hussain, Hon'ble Saiyed Raza Ali, Mr. Saiyed Hussain, Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, Hon'ble Mr. Jinnah, Dr. Saif-ud-din Kitchlew, Aga Safdar Sahib, and Maulana Hasrat Mohani.

RESOLUTION IV

Resolved that a representative Muslim deputation be sent to Constantinople so that tendering on behalf of the Indian Mussulmans it may express humble devotion and sentiments of Islamic brotherhood before the Commander of the Faithful, the successor of the holy prophet, the Sultan of Turkey : it

also resolves that arrangements be made for sending this deputation so far as possible along with other deputations proceeding to England and America.

The resolutions was moved by Maulvi Mazharuddin, Editor, 'Dastoor' and supported by Maulvi Mahommad Akram.

RESOLUTION V

This meeting of the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Amritsar expresses its extreme sorrow and regret that the demands of the Indian Mussulmans regarding the Khilafat Jaziratul Arab holy places and the preservation of the status quo ante belum of the Ottoman Empire have not yet been acceded to and that on the contrary utterances of the ministers of the British Crown from time to time give rise to strong suspicions that the representatives of the British Government do not desire that these demands should be acceded to, this conference therefore deems it absolutely essential to declare that the Indian Mussulmans still stand firmly by those demands which the law of the Islam made it incumbent upon them to formulate and express, and the Conference desires to declare in the clearest possible manner that if the British Government will accept terms in the peace conference as may be inconsistent with the requirements of our faith, in that case our attitude will be governed by the obligations vigorously imposed upon us by our faith, and for this the British Government alone will be responsible.

The resolution was maved by Mr. Mahommed Ali and supported by Mr. Zafar Ali Khan.

RESOLUTION VI

Resolved that a Khilafat fund be immediately opened and the Central Khilafat Committee of India in Bombay, be instructed to make the necessary arrangements for the collection of at least a sum of ten lacs of rupees from every part of India; it also requests the Indian Mussulmans in general and the Khilafat Committees in particular to render every possible assistance to the Central Khilafat Committee in this connection.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Mumtaz Hussain and supported by Maulana Hasrat Mohani.

RESOLUTION VII

This Conference is of opinion that the attempt made by some of the Government officials in Sindh against the objects of the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Delhi call for special attention of the Bombay Government; this conference therefore trusts that such officials will not only be warned for future but will be awarded proper punishment to prevent the recurrence of such proceedings.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Abdul Majid, editor 'Al-Amin' Hyderabad, Sindh and supported by Hafiz Atmullah of Amritsar.

RESOLUTION VIII

That the constitution framed by the Central Khilafat Committee of India, Bombay, be printed and circulated among the various district and provincial Khilafat committees of India and their opinions be invited thereon and that a session of the All-India Khilafat Conference be held as soon as possible at Bombay at which the draft constitution may be discussed and approved from the chair. Maulana Shaukat Ali sent the following telegram to H. E. the Viceroy :

'As president of the Amritsar session of the All-India Khilafat Conference I have been directed to request H. E. the Viceroy to be pleased to receive a small deputation consisting of the leading representative Mussulmans of India to lay before him the views and the religious sentiments of the Mussulmans in connection with the Turkish question. I trust H. E. will be pleased to receive such a deputation and that an early date in January may suit H. E.'s convenience. The names of the members of the deputation will be forwarded when desired for His Excellency's approval.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1920.

42

TWELFTH SESSION : ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE, AMRITSAR PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, HAZIQ-UL-MULK, HAKIM MOHD. AJMAL KHAN

30 December 1919

Amritsar, where we are now holding the annual gatherings of the Congress and the All India Muslim League, has been the scene of the incidents which shall ever remain indelible and ugly blots of the history of British Raj in India. But the fact that inspite of the most depressing and dispiriting happenings, the citizens of Amritsar have made it possible for the Congress and the League to hold their sessions here, calls for our admiration for these spirited patriots, and while fully appreciating their courage, perseverence, and manliness we must testify that they have by their behaviour, furnished an occulter demonstration of the fact that Martial Law and its tyrannies are as powerless to silence the voice of Truth as they ever deserve to remain. But the responsibility for the occurrences whether of Lahore, Amritsar or Kasur must primarily be placed at the door of the Government who have so far been ruling India without the best regard for the desires of their fellow subjects,

and the passage of Rowlatt Act is a concrete illustration of that disregard. This legislation was unanimously opposed by all the elected Indian members of the Legislative Council, and every section of Indian population raised its voice against it, but the Government turned a deaf ear to all these voices out of tender regard for the fetish of prestige, making it possible for all the woeful events of Delhi and the Punjab to follow, which we and our coming generations are never likely to forget. It is not given to any common individual to appreciate the particular necessity for enacting the Rowlatt Act. It is generally asked why the legislation of the Rowlatt Act was deemed essential, while such effective weapons as the prevention of seditious meetings Act, the Press Act and the D. I. A. were available in the armoury of repressive enactments and more especially when rightly or wrongly the proclamation of Martial Law, by means of an ordinance was fully within the limits of Government's competence. If, however, the question of prestige is alone responsible for the passage of the obnoxious legislation, then I fear the consequences of the enactment have been more deleterious to the Government's prestige than the other state of affairs might possibly have been.

Passing now from this initial blunder of the Government of India we come to the Punjab where we meet with an abundant store of mistakes. To begin with, the late Lieut. Governor of this province speaking from his privileged place in the provincial legislative council said that drastic proceedings would be taken against the opponents of the Rowlatt Bill. I am not sure how far such a threat, coming as it did from the representative of a constitutional Government, could be regarded as proper : for the entire activity in the Punjab involved in the struggle against the Rowlatt Act, was strictly within constitutional limits. The pronouncement by the Exsatrap of the minatory words referred to above would tantamount to declaring the mere protest against any legislation undertaken by the Government as criminal. One, however, does not know under what law such an offence would fall. A possible rejoinder may be that under the D. I. A. whose elasticity in obedience to the official will have become notorious, any constitutional activity of this kind may become punishable. Enthusiastic protests and demonstrations took place in other provinces as well but the heads of those provinces did not feel the necessity of resorting to minatory declamations, nor did it become necessary for them to have recourse to shooting and killing people, and delivering their provinces over to military authorities for Martial Law. It was this flagrantly misguided and repressive activity which on the 3rd and the 5th April last took the form of muzzling Drs. Satyapal and Kitchlew, the two popular leaders of Amritsar. Not content with this blunder, the pace of mistaken activity was accelerated, and on the 10th of the same month these leaders were deported from Amritsar. This deportation was undertaken at a time when responsible officials fully anticipated disturbing consequences—'a fact' elicited by Sir Chimanlal Sitalvad in his cross-examination of Mr. Miles Irving, who admitted having anticipated agitation as the result of the depor-

tation of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal.

In view of these circumstances the responsibility for all that followed the flagrantly unwise order of deportation must necessarily be laid at the door of the authority from whom the order emanated, particularly when we know that there existed no trace of any public excitement of the kind anticipated, previous to the blunder. A Hartal followed as an inevitable result, but according to Mr. Jarman, the Municipal Engineer of Amritsar, there were no signs of disorder notwithstanding the cessation of business. In fact, Mr. Miles Irving himself admits in his statement that previous to the firing at the bridge, the crowd did not seem disposed to rioting but wanted to make a representation to the head of the district for the restoration of the deported leaders. So far from there being any testimony in the official evidence to the crowd's disorderly tendency, the facts that the crowd passed Europeans and Government buildings on its way to the D. C.'s bungalow without signifying any inclination to interfere with them, their desire to petition the D. C. for the restoration of their leaders, their not being in possession of sticks or lathis at the time are evident proofs of their peaceful disposition. But the atrocity of opening fire on them was perpetrated in spite of all this which resulted in the regrettable occurrences at the railway station, the banks and other places involving the loss of European lives (which I deplore as deeply as any other man) and once again the Deputy Commissioner had recourse to firing. All was quiet from the 10th to the 12th.

The next day was the well-known 'Baisakhi' festival and a considerable assemblage of men took place in the Jallianwala Bagh which was gallantly and courageously attacked by General Dyer, who had previous to reaching the spot decided to open fire on them. In his evidence before the Hunter Committee, he proudly boasted that he 'fired and fired well' for 'little firing' was, in his opinion, 'bad'. He further admitted that he had made no medical arrangements for the wounded, as all the hospitals were open to them. Finally, replying to Sahibzada Sultan Ahmad Khan he affirmed that there was no difference between mere civil disorder and rebellion. It is to be profoundly deplored that the lives of His Majesty's subjects are entrusted to the care of men, who are capable of boastfully proclaiming that they 'fired and fired well', who are ignorant of the difference between the menial offence of ordinarily riotous disorder and the heinous crime of rebellion, and who are incapable of realising that the wounded cannot attend hospitals without somebody's aid. The Commander-in-Chief may profitably open some institutions for teaching such men the difference between ordinary disorders and grave rebellions, the common sense about the inability of the wounded to walk to the hospitals without any help and finally to instruct them in the elementary principles of humanity which require that human life should be treated as valuable and should not be taken without the profoundest consideration. For a number of a fair and democratic people to have the wantonness to set his heart on firing on fellow beings without taking adequate

thought, is a revoltingly execrable atrocity. It deserves to be mentioned with poignant anguish that Indian blood was recklessly made to flow in Jallianwala, with the outrageous result that so far over 500 dead have been traced. In reply to the Hon'ble Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya's interpellation in the Council, official admission went upto 290, but Amritsar's Deputy Commissioner's evidence has unmasked the reality in the amusing statement admitting the number of person killed as 3, 4, or 5 hundred—the uncertainty of hundreds deserves marked attention. This figure has been corroborated by General Dyer himself who admitted having fired 1650 rounds which according to him may have killed 400 to 500 men. This firing becomes all the more indefensible and deplorable when we are told that it was quite possible to disperse the crowd in Jallianwala without recourse to firing, as admitted by General Dyer in the course of his cross-examination. Another matter which deserves to be specially mentioned is the operation of Martial Law before it had been actually proclaimed on the night between the 15th and the 16th April last On the 11th April the administrative control of the District was delivered up to General Dyer, and punishments and orders began to emanate from him. One is, however, left wondering what legal sanction these proceedings resulting as they did in the loss of more than :00 lives of His Majesty's subjects, not entitle one to expect that at least the persons who are directly liable for these deeds of violence will receive the punishment which they richly deserve ?

Who can forget the outrageous crawling order of General Dyer, by which human beings were compelled, under pain of punishment, to degrade themselves to the level of animals, and who can ever forget infamous floggings ? Did not this very General assert in the course of his examination by the Hunter Committee, that India was the 'land of Salaams', where Indians 'understood and ought to understand Salaaming'. Indians owe it to the honour of their country now to fully grasp the lesson of this assertion and to demonstrate by their behaviour in future what they have learnt by it. Amritsar occurrences reacted on Lahore and elsewhere in the Punjab, and a wave of indignation, caused by these wrongs, swept over the province. The Hartal of the 6th April last peacefully passed off at Lahore, but the news of Mahatma Gandhi's arrest, effected under orders of the Exsatarp of the Punjab, soon had its effect on the people of Lahore, who assembled in a large crowd to go to the Government House with the object of appealing to the L. G. for the cancellation of his order. This crowd was stopped on the Mall and turned back and it is stated that the crowd was first fired on while returning and again, while it was nearing the Lahori Gate. On the 11th people were busy with the obsequies of the dead and on the 13th they held a meeting in the Badshahi Mosque to express their sorrow. Some people, however, stripped and burnt the clothes of a C. I. D. officer, which at all events, was a regrettable act. As the people came out of the mosque on the termination of the meeting, they were fired on by the military at some neighbouring place. Then

came the arrests of some of the well-known and able leaders of the people such as Lala Harikishan Lal, Pandit Raj Bhuj Dutt, Mr. Duni Chand Bar-at-Law, and others, who could under no circumstances be suspected of countenancing any kind of disorder, and who had made every possible effort to maintain peace and order in the town. But we are all painfully familiar with the treatment they received in return for their civic labours and I advisedly refrain from dilating on this painful topic.

It seems that the late Lieut. Governor, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, desired to benefit not only his own province by his 'Nadirshahi' reign but wanted to extend its blessing to other parts of India as well. He had proposed to penalize *The Independent* newspaper from his seat in Lahore, but the Government of the United Provinces did not prove amenable to the wisdom of undertaking the duty of carrying out each and every whim of his late Honour. It is, however, regrettable that this newspaper's office could not escape the distinction of a police search. It is understood that he was also instigating the Delhi authorities to proclaim Martial Law and desired to have other provinces in the same boat with his 'Satraphy', so that it might evade being marked out as a solitary example, but he failed to achieve his end. He had Mr. Goverdhan Das arrested in the Madras Presidency solely on the ground that the latter had dared to furnish a correct account of all the events of the Punjab and its ruler to the Press, also that the wires which Pt. Rambhujdutt could not, on account of his arrest, send to the Secretary of State and the Viceroy were despatched by him. He was ultimately prosecuted and has not yet been restored to us. All the occurrences of the Punjab were almost wholly due to reactionary methods. Had wiser counsels prevailed, there is ample reason to believe that not a single life would have been lost. If fire had not been opened on the unarmed crowd in Amritsar, if Mr. Gandhi had not been arrested and if the advice of the leaders had been listened to, it can be stated without fear of contradiction that, so far as the Punjab was concerned, no untoward incident would have taken place.

The late Lieut. Governor did not content himself with proclaiming Martial Law in some cities, but gave a 'carte blache' to men of such pronounced 'competence' as General Dyer, in Amritsar and Col. Frank Johnson, in Lahore. The latter, in his evidence before the Hunter Committee, has said that 277 persons were tried by the Summary Courts, out of whom 207 were convicted and 66 were whipped, the total number of stripes amounting to 800. The latter figure included men who were publicly flogged. The Colonel has also opined if not in so many words, that this method of punishment was full of the milk of human kindness. Further, he is responsible for the statement that the people liked the Martial Law and were grateful to him for maintaining peace and order. It seems that the people who manifested such remarkable admiration for Martial Law were not lucky enough to have a taste of the punishment which was brimful of kindness otherwise they would have been less eager to express their partiality for such a 'regime'. He has

further stated that on the 10th when fire was opened on a crowd of about eight thousand men on the Mall, it resulted in the loss of one human life and five or six wounded, which was due to the fact that the firing of the Police force was very much below third class. It is a pity that none of the members of the Hunter Committee appears to have asked the gallant Colonel what in his opinion would have been the result of firing by one, who had hardly ever shouldered a gun, on a crowd of eight thousand. The only answer according to Frank Johnsonian logic could be that none would have been injured at all. It is noteworthy that Col. Frank Johnson likes the jails immensely, and seems to regard them as unusally comfortable. If jail is really the place of such comforts it would have been the most proper thing for the Colonel to send there those of his admirers who expressed their deep appreciation of the Martial Law.

Lieut. Col. Frank Johnson, who holds a high rank in the army, and who can unmistakably be considered an expert in military matters, has further observed that 'whipping is equal to a thousand soldiers' in military equation, of course. Col. Johnson should certainly be sent to the front on some future occasion, so that in an actual engagement he may be dispersing with soldiers, prove the striking effectiveness of the weapon he had discovered-alas, at the conclusion of the late war-and vanquish the enemy with 'its' aid. The credit of the discovery must ever belong to this renowned and gallant soldier. Later on, he has also deposed that the order to shoot any person who stood in the day of opening shops emanated from him, and again he has affirmed that as peace in the city depend upon the cessation of the Hartal, no punishment could be too severe. It is alleged that the Martial Law notice which was posted on the Sanatan Dharma College building was torn down by some unknown person and led the Col. to detain the five hundred men belonging to the College, who were made to march long distances in the heat of summer. They were let go after two day's detention. On this point, Sir. C. Sitalvad asked him if he considered it the proper discharge of his duty to march five hundred students to the fort under the burning sun of Lahore, and the reply of the merciful and justice-loving Colonel was that he was prepared to do it again, if necessary. We learn from this gallant officer that he was responsible for punishing one thousand and eleven students. These punishments are in addition to those inflicted by the Police. In answer to a question on this point the chivalrous Colonel is reported to have stated that information was received that many students were insulting English women and that was why he looked upon his orders, which were undoubtedly severe, as right and just, and he would continue to hold that opinion. It is a pity no one asked him on which dates after the 10th. European women were seen out, and who were the boys complained against. Is it now deeply regrettable that on the strength of baseless and absurd rumours or predelictions, poor students were subjected to the subtle tortures which are truly barbarous, and shall ever continue to be regarded so.

He admitted his responsibility for a ridiculous order before the Hunter Committee, according to which no two 'natives' could walk abreast in front of an European, lest the latter should be provoked to commit a breach of the King's peace.

And again, I feel a certain commiseration for this colonel, within whom burnt the fire of conscience with a steady flame, when he confesses his weakness in having punished a Magistrate for interfering with a marriage procession and having the offenders, including a priest, flogged. The reason why I feel compassion for the Colonel is that in my opinion this order of the Magistrate did nothing to offend against justice, but perhaps necessity and expediency required it, for it brought out the real character of the likely ends which came within the opration of Martial Law. If two 'natives' could not walk together in front of an European lest the latter should be provoked to commit a breach of peace, in the case of a marriage procession the fear of a graver disturbance would be thoroughly justified.

In this instance, by arresting a marriage party which was supposed to be defying the Marital Law, in so far as it carried with it the potentialities of a breach of the peace, and flogging it, the one beneficial result which followed was that the whole city came to know of the incident and the Colonel was saved the inconvenience of administering this punishment to others, as the example must have terrorised the whole city. I am, therefore, truly grieved that Col. Johnson during his 'strong administration' betrayed the weakness, induced by qualms of conscience of dismissing a Magistrate who, keeping the maintenance of peace and order in view, had, all in a bonafide way, ordered this supremely merciful and sublimely kind mode of chastisement. I wonder if this Magistrate would care to bring the matter to the notice of Sir Michael O'Dwyer (for it was during his Ex-Honour's term of office that an honest maintainer of peace was so unjustly treated, and prefer Colonel's order of dismissal. It would be unjust to overlook the incident of and the action against the noble and gallant Shahi Mosque and the closing of its doors upon Mahommedan Mosque-goers, for it constitutes the most illustrious episode of the O'Dwyerian rule, never likely to be efaced from our memories. It would be an act of folly for the Mussulmans to complain against this outrage. They should see it for themselves that it was here that a C.I.D. Officer was stripped of his clothes, and the only merciful punishment for so wanton a disregard of the all too fine susceptibilities of the department could be the closing of the Mosque altogether for the time being. If it had remained open and the same incident had been repeated the consequences for the Mussulmans would have been indeed very grave. It was also possible that the people might congregate there on the pretext of saying prayers but really to conspire against the Government and, then, Col. Johnson or the civil authorities, would have been obliged to adopt severe measures. Moreover, the Mussulmans should remember that if the Colonel closed the Langar Khanas, meant for distributing food among the poor and the hungry, because 'rebellion also could be

promoted there' (against which grave contingency the city had to be guarded), the closing of the mosque must have been dictated by tender regard for the benefit of the Mahommedans themselves. It was apparent that their not congregating there for prayers would insure them against the catastrophe, resulting from fanning the flame of rebellion. This mosque may have been closed on another possible ground. On the 12th when a number of Mussulmans were returning from it, the Colonel's guard was attacked in the rear (the Colonel is silent as to how and with what weapon) and perhaps an accidental but vigorous dead-set was made at the Col. himself with the help of a big or trifling brickbat. Placed in such a helpless situation, if the Col. ordered firing and some lives were lost, the matter should not assume the magnitude of a complaint; for according to the recently propounded principle already referred to while dealing with the evidence produced before the Hunter Committee in Delhi only 'a trifling number of men were killed to save a large number from decimation.' If the Colonel had refrained from firing, it was quite within the pale of possibility that the centre of the army would have been rushed, which would have led to more deaths among the crowd than actually took place on the 12th.

He also had 4 aeroplanes to hover over the city which was an act of foresight. For, endowed with a rare genius, this warlord anticipated, that if the citizen threw bombs the lives of his soldiers would be lost in vain and to provide against such a contingency he had kept two aeroplanes in readiness to go up at once at a given signal and drop bombs on the city. This wisdom propelled precaution achieved a remarkable end, namely, that the citizens were (according to the perverse imagination of the gallant Colonel) prevented from using their hand grenades and the Colonel's army through his foresight and God's grace, remained intact and quite safe.

KASUR

After describing the incidents at Lahore we come to Kasur. The following is a bare statement of facts gathered from the evidence of official witness who appeared before the Hunder Committee —

On the 11th April last, a public meeting was held at Kasur, at which speeches were delivered about the Rowlatt Act.

A Hartal followed the news of Mahatma Gandhi's arrest and continued till the 12th

On the 12th a procession of people carrying black flags proceeded towards the station, when according to the evidence of Mr. P. Marsden, the Subdivisional officer, the leaders declared that the British Raj had come to an end. The people attacked the railway station, [illegible] own goods, wagons, and passenger trains, and looted all the cash which they found there. Similar incidents took place at Khan Karan and the station was damaged at Patti.

At the Kasur Railway Station a train was stopped. Two soldiers who

were travelling on this train fired one or two shots on the crowd, after which they were attacked and killed. The crowd was shouting that two of their men had been killed (which meant that they meant to avenge their death).

On the same day, three hundred Indian and fifty British soldiers reached Kasur, under the command of Captain Macray, and on the 16th April he declared Martial Law before a public meeting held at the Town Hall.

The total number of arrests made 172, out of which fifty one persons were convicted, and the rest were discharged or acquitted.

In addition to these, two persons shot by the sentry, because they failed to reply when challenged, and one of them was a deaf mute.

During this period the people were subjected to various punishment which must be mentioned :

A cage was put up in which people were imprisoned, and they were obliged to answer the calls of nature where they were.

Some persons were made to draw lines on the ground with their nose as vouched by some reliable persons.

But the military officer, responsible for this punishment, stated, that he did not make such an order, but had only ordered men to prostrate themselves on the ground which was a form of Salaaming.

The Head Master of a high school, and an aged man were flogged.

On the 3rd May a public gallows was erected but was subsequently removed by the order of the Punjab Government.

The Head Master of the Municipal Board School complained that the boys disobeyed his orders. He was, therefore, asked to send any three boys for punishment. As that three boys sent by the Head Master were physically weak, a second order was sent to him to furnish three robust boys who were selected and sent and were punished for the misfortune of being physically strong.

The Head Master of the Islamia School had made no complaint against his boys but three lads from this school too were similarly punished.

The entire male population of Kasur, numbering some eight to ten thousand, were summoned for identification several times, and were ordered to bare their heads.

The police searched the houses of eight pleaders, and arrested several others, including those who had helped the Government to maintain peace and order. Mr. Dhanpat Rai, Pleader, was arrested without any evidence of any kind against him.

Persons were flogged before prostitutes, who were collected to witness the punishment.

Forty persons were flogged, each receiving 18 strips on an average, and some students were publicly flogged.

From twenty to twenty-five persons were given the fancy punishment of 'skipping', which was said to be good for their health.

A poet who had been arrested was asked by Capt. Deveton, the Martial

Law administrator, to write an ode in his honour and was released in reward for it.

How can one characterise these punishments except as being a leaf out of medieval history. In the present age inflicting such punishments and proudly boasting about them can only come of individuals wholly devoid of last human attributes.

GUJRANWALA

The occurrence of Gujranwala were still worse. Here the unarmed civil populace was bombed from aeroplanes for the first, and let us hope, for the last time in India.

On the 6th April hartal was observed. But previous to this, on 5th April a public meeting was convened at which people were enjoined to observe Hartal, in speeches, which according to Colonel O'Brien incited the people to acts of lawlessness. On the 14th April, a disturbance took place, as described in official evidence which led to burning of the station, the cutting of telegraph wires and damages to the court buildings. Government property and railway stations were partially damaged in fourteen places other than Gujranwala. Some Europeans were also assaulted at some of these places. But the most heinous crime alleged to have been committed at Ramnagar was the burning of the King's effigy after which some people went to bathe in the river.

On the 14th aeroplanes were sent to Gujranwala where six bombs were thrown. But the damage done by two of these bombs is stated to be six killed and six injured. Colonel O'Brien's evidence is silent about the damage done by the four remaining bombs. He has given the total number of casualties as twenty-seven, including eleven killed, which figure appears astonishingly small, in view of the frequent bombing and machine-gunning from the aeroplanes.

Colonel O'Brien then goes on to say that at 11, the same morning the police fired on the people, for the first time when Mr. Heron was assaulted. On the second occasion, a crowd crossing the railway line was fired on, without any reason after which wherever people collected, they were fired on. It does not require very hard thinking to come to the conclusion that the gallant Colonel's memory has played him false in regard to the number of casualties. It is, one might observe with regret, the inferior shooting by the police, which deprived certain persons of the satisfaction of doing justice to Gujranwala.

Colonel O'Brien asserted that order could be restored only with the help of the army, and Martial Law would not have been necessary if Summary Courts had been established. However, according to Col. Macray everything emanated from the Punjab Government, of whose will the District authorities were mere instruments.

A catalogue of all the wrongs committed before or after the announcement of Martial Law, would be rather prolix, but a few concrete

illustrations would not be out of place. Enumerated thus are —

(1) Flogging publicly,
(2) Refusal to admit people to bail.
(3) The arrest of persons, on information supplied by the Police, without due enquiry.
(4) Handcuffing and marching those under arrest, a distance of two miles through the Bazar, preceded by two Municipal Commissioners, one Hindu and one Mussulman, (most probably to ridicule Hindu-Muslim unity).
(5) Sending twenty-three arrested persons of Lahore by cattle trucks, and marching them through the bazars of Lahore.
(6) Punishing a police sergeant for failing to give evidence as directed.

Gentlemen, this is a brief but deeply sad tale of the inhuman reaction of which the fair Province Punjab has been the victim. I have refrained from dwelling on all the atrocities in detail for the obvious reason that you yourselves are fully familiar with them.

DELHI AND PUNJAB

I have, after carefully weighing all the circumstances, arrived at the conclusion that the Delhi and Punjab occurrences were due to a series of blunders. I see behind all these happenings one mistake after another, like those committed by a physician, who causes endless harm to the patient, by failing to diagnose the disease. Had not the Rowlatt Act been passed in the teeth of the opposition referred to, not the smallest event of an untoward nature would have taken place in Delhi or the Punjab. The enactment was considered the last remedy. It was not translated into practice in Delhi, but the better part of the country regarded it as an acceptable idea. As I have already said, not a drop of blood would have been shed in Delhi, if better counsels had prevailed. The Chief Commissioner certainly acted with patience, and largely helped to save the situation, but all that occurred in Delhi is traceable to the mistakes of other officials. Had no firing taken place at the Railway Station as none took place in the King Edward Park, the situation would have been peacefully overcome.

Coming to the Punjab, the Amritsar happenings clearly show that the initial blunder consisted in the muzzling and deportation orders, served on Drs. Satyapal and Kitchlew, which emanated direct from Lahore, without previous consultation, with the 'man on the spot', who had every right of being entrusted with the sole responsibility of keeping order in this district, to be consulted in respect to so delicate a matter. This led to all the sad occurrences which followed. I have a right to ask any right-minded person, if in his opinion any of the gruesome events we all know, and which have been referred to above, would have come to pass, if the initial blunder had

not been perpetrated. Similary, but for Mr. Gandhi's arrest at Palwal, and firing on the crowd at Lahore there was no fear of any untoward event at Lahore. The crowd could easily be dispersed by other means as represented by the leaders to the authorities at the time. The occurrences of Kasur and Gujranwala too, arose out of like blunders, otherwise the demonstrations would have ceased in a short time, as generally happened everywhere.

LORD HUNTER'S COMMITTEE

The Disorders Enquiry Committee was appointed in response to India's constant demand for a searching inquiry into these occurrences. It commenced its work in November, at Delhi, regarding the Delhi and the Punjab occurrences. We have no right to pronounce any premature judgment and must patiently await its Report. Although our bitter experience of such committees in the past has been abundantly depressing, we must 'wait and see' and refrain from expressing any opinion. Considering the fact that the findings of the Hunter Committee will, at most, have a moral effect, we cannot have any very high expectation of it nor can we fail to observe the more or less inconsequential nature of its labours, for has not the Indemnity Act taken the wind out of its sails, by guaranteeing impunity to officials whose appalling infractions would, in a court of law, have assumed the magnitude of grave crimes. This Act also covers the mistakes previous to the operation of Martial Law, and goes as far back as the 30th March last. It is therefore not a matter for ponder that delinquent officials are encouraged to confess their crimes with unseemly audacity, for they feel that they have a right to say and to worse things.

THE NON-OFFICIAL COMMITTEE

As borne out by the procedure adopted at Delhi, it was not originally intended by the Congress Committee to boycott the Hunter Committee. But their modest request for the enlargement of certain Punjab leaders (who are suffering incarceration for no crime other than that of being leaders), with a view to secure the best non-official evidence, was rejected, and they were constrained in the last resort, regretfully, to decide that they should refrain from leading any evidence before the Hunter Committee, but produce the same before the non-official committee, which is also doing its work. The non-official report will, no doubt, present the other side of the picture in bright colours. I am of opinion that General Dyer, Colonel Frank Johnson and some others have greatly lightened the task of the non-official committee. In fact, India may be fully content with reprinting the statements of those witnesses and circulating them widely in England to bring home to the British the real nature of the share of some of their able representatives in ruling India and also to let them have an idea of the value and worth these men

attach to Indian lives. There is however a good deal of work before this committee, and we hope it will take early steps to publish both in India and England the evidence it has collected.

RESULT OF REPRESSION

It is India's misfortune that the men at the helm of her affairs, seem to be actuated with the belief that the central principle of Government ever be repression.

Although the evidence daily accumulating drives one to the conclusion that repression ever leaves a vigorous dynamic force in its wake, yet our Government prefers to adhere to its antiquated political creed, its daily increasing deleterious results notwithstanding.

If Lord Curzon laid India under a debt of gratitude by the partition of Bengal, Sir Michael O'Dwyer has done nothing less, by his *Nadirshahi* rule in the Punjab, and of which we shall soon begin to be conscious. Sir Michael will have occasion to be proud of his achievement, if political activity is snuffed out in the Punjab. But, if the real political life of the province begins after his strenuous efforts to stamp it out, the ex-satrap will have occasion to realise the magnitude of his blunder. He will then realise that the bitter poison he ministered to the Punjab, actually proved the elixir of life to her.

THE REFORMS

The forthcoming Reforms will, no doubt, go a certain length to affect the anti-diluvian nature of the existing constitution. But, so long as India's share in the Central Government is not of a really satisfactory nature, we cannot hope to have seen the last of the massacre of Jallianwala and the bombing of Gujranwala. We have not the least doubt about the good intentions of the Right Hon. Edwin Samuel Montague, who, we fully realise, has not merely taken endless pains to achieve the successful conclusion of his efforts in regard to the reform scheme, but has evinced great perseverence and statesmanship, in winning the goal in spite of the reactionary efforts of certain parties. He has established his claim to be regarded a true well-wisher and benefactor of India. But, we cannot help observing that these reforms fall short even of the minimum demand of India.

Judging the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons relating to the Central Government, in the light of the announcement of the 20th August 1917, we are constrained to say that they do not fulfil the promise vouchsafed to us. Nor can it be said that increasing the number of Indian members of the Central Executive Council means the devolution of responsibility in the real sense. Such affect as it may possibly have must needs be confined to the moral sphere. It is, however, satisfactory to note that the Joint Committee has rejected the Grand Committee, and recom-

mended the constitution of the Council of State as a true revising chamber, which seems to be free from the defects of the former and curtails our apprehensions. The Joint Committee has offered useful counsel with regard to the selection of the President of the Indian Legislature. It is rightly advised that great deliberation should be exercised in selecting for this office one who apart from being a man of acknowledged ability should also possess experience of parliamentary principles and procedure. Provincial Governors are invested with power to dismiss ministers, which, in other words, means that the ministers will be subject to the executive pressure which may prove an impediment in the way of the realisation of legitimate and beneficial aims which they may have in view. It will also give rise to a belief in the country that the possibility of the Indians availing themselves of the modest share allowed to them in the provincial Councils has been curtailed to a certain extent in this way. Then, who does not know that Bombay, Bengal, and Madras, are the advanced provinces of India, and they are certainly ahead of certain other provinces in the fields of education, commerce and political actitivity. Would it not evoke their resentment when they find that they get nothing more than Commerce, Industry and Education in 'transferred subjects', although they are, without the least doubt, entitled to much more. To allow provincial legislatures responsible control over commerce, industry and less important subjects, is decidedly a disappointment for India. Then we realise that we have no 'fiscal autonomy' which is the essence of our demands regarding economic control, without which commerce and industry must needs remain in a static and lifeless condition, we can hardly entertain any hope of developing our commerce and industry. With reference to the subject of education, no opinion can be formed regarding some of the reservations hinted at in the Joint Committee's Report, until they are before us in definite form. But I hope, as authoritatively stated in reliable circles, Education will be a completely 'transferred subject'. A good step seems to have been taken in respect to the question of franchise, by recognising the demands of the depressed classes. But, Indian leaders are unable to understand why the rulers and subjects of native states are put on the same footing as British Indian subjects, in regard to the right of 'vote' and 'election'; and it is difficult for them to extend a warm welcome to this innovation. The Joint Committee does not appear generous in not applying the principle of enfranchisement to women as a whole, althogh overlooked. It would have been advisable to select some provinces for the operation of the right after it had been even partially recognised by the Joint Committee.

It would be a great injustice to declare those convicted for more than 6 months as ineligible for election for 5 years. Unless a reservation is made in favour of those who are convicted of offences relating to the State, such as S. 124A, will be deprived of some of the best men of our country, who have been the victims (from time to time) of executive blunders.

I regret to say that the Bill fixes the period of our political schooling at

ten years. which, compared with other courses of instruction, appears to be long and tedious, especially because we are left in a state of uncertainty. At the conclusion of this period, supposing the Parliamentary Committee does no more than make immaterial recommendations, at the end of ten years, it would not be possible to predict the number of decades for which India may have to wait for the attainment of complete Self-Government. This uncertainty could be disposed of, by adhering to the Congress-League Scheme. Unless there is a definite promise that India will get Self-Government within 15 or 20 years, it is futile to expect India for ever to continue to value the modest gift of the Reform Scheme. The appointment of a Parliamentary Standing Committee for advising Government on important Indian matters is satisfactory in as much as it promises to rescue India from the cold indifference which has been her lot so far. It signifies that a welcome beginning of the process of realising India's importance is being made. It is now essential for India to have a permanent organisation in London to co-operate with the Parliamentary Committee when necessary, and to place Indian aspirations before Britain more prominently. It would be quite appropriate to entrust this task to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and the London Branch of the Muslim League, but it is necessary to consider the ways of making them more useful. At present it will be our duty to devote special attention to the rules which are going to be appended to the Reform Act. If we fail to devote this task the time which it deserves, the few benefits now accruing to us may also dwindle. However, looking at the Reforms as a whole, we should welcome them as the first stone of the foundation of Self-Government. We must not allow the occurrences of the Punjab, and the question of Turkey to prevent us from taking that interest in them which as Indians is our duty to do. Although we are not likely to forget the deep agony caused by the occurrences of the Punjab and the events relating to the Holy places, Khilafat and Turkey, we should, while continuing our constitutional struggle, make a united effort to make the Reforms successful, as on that well depend our future development.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

The secret of the success, not merely of the Reform Scheme, but of all the work which is being done by Indians in India and abroad, lies in Hindu-Muslim unity. There is no need to look back, as both these communities have fully realised it now, that unity alone can be the firm foundation of India's real improvement and future progress. Although war is rightly regarded a calamity, the share the world war (now happily ended) has had in forging the links of unity between these two great communities, entitles us to say that the war has bequeathed to India a legacy which is likely to prove the key to the success of the national self-realisation of India. I must, however, confess that there are certain matters which at times come in the way of the full realisation of this blessing. Those who are inspired by a genuine

desire to serve their country cannot be affected by any differences of race or creed, which are the same to day as they were before. Hindu-Muslim relations, however, appear to be infinitely more satisfactory than they have been in past years. The question of Government appointments is no longer capable of engaging our attention to any appreciable degree, and although political rights were the subject of much controversy between them before. the Congress-League compact of 1916 went a very long way to settle that matter. Such other matters as the League and the Congress may still require to have an understanding about, will I am sure, be easily settled between them on some appropriate occasion.

PRESERVATION OF COWS

I shall, therefore, address myself to the one question which has an importance quite its own, and which is none other than the preservation of cows. We have, for some time past, been indulging in indirect allusions and vague hints and to my mind it is high time that this question was dealt with in clear and specific terms with a view to reaching a satisfactory conclusion. Some of the methods which some of our Hindu brethren, have at times permitted themselves to adopt for the attainment of their object have, in certain instances, undoubtedly proved highly objectionable, and naturally tending to defeat the very purpose aimed at. But to-day, when both Hindus and Muslims are marching together through a new era, when varied phases of unity, the possibility of the resumption of such fruitless efforts is becoming remote. In fact, we are now inspired by that spirit of patriotism which is sure to prove the key to the solution, not merely of the question of the preservation of cows, but also to the final settlements of all other differences. When two sactions began to co-operate in a spirit of living comradeship, sharing one another's burdens, the inevitable result follows and their differences passing through various phases of mutual toleration finally merge in community of interest with circumstances referred to, and the very differences are transformed into the surest basis of united endeavours.

Our Hindu compatriots have for some time past, been making genuine efforts to meet us more than half way, and deserve our sincerest gratitude for their good will. It is, indeed, a testimony to their keen realisation of the needs of nation building. It, therefore, behaves us, as inheritors of a noble creed, to reciprocate their amiable regard with greater warmth and good will to demonstrate that our faith teaches us that every good act deserves a better return. Our Hindu brethren enthusistically and spontaneously observed the Khilafat day with us and in closing their business to share our sorrow they evinced remarkably large sympathies. They cheerfully bore great commercial loss only to prove their sincere regard for our sentiments in regard to a matter which was exclusively religious, and could claim their interest in no other way. Can these sincere demonstrations of friendly regard and good will go for nothing ? Most certainly not; nor can they possibly fail to evoke

the deserving responses from a people not dead to all noble feelings. Again, what but the promotion of commendable reciprocity and co-operation in exclusive religious matters can be a surer guarantee of India's future welfare and progress ? Indeed this is the only point on which we are without the least hesitancy unanimously agreed. The matter which is entirely for Muslims to decide, is what practical step they are going to take to demonstrate their appreciation of this principle, to reassure Hindu brethren. Not a soul among Mussulmans would hesitate to vouchsafe the necessary assurance. In fact, they should enthusiastically respond to such a call, and do whatever they legitimately can, to consummate such an object. They should, in so far as it lies in their power refrain from acts calculated to wound the susceptibilities of their compatriots.

We are, and should be, fully cognisant of the fact that cow killing seriously annoys our fellow countrymen. But before holding out any assurance to them, we must first see in what light our religion views this question. We must also determine the extent in which 'Qurbani' is enjoined upon us—irrespective, of course, of the slaughter of cows. According to Islam, 'Qurbani' or sacrifice offering is only a Sunati-Muwakkidah, a practice observed by the Prophet and emphatically enjoined on his followers which Mussulmans, as Mussulmans, so long as they can afford it, must observe. Now, it is a matter of choice to fulfil this observance by sacrificing camels, sheep, goat or cow, which simply means that any of these animals can be fit offerings. Crores of Indian Muslims must be strangers to the slaughter of camel, for the fulfilment of this observance, but none of them can possibly be accused of the slightest religious omission. On the contrary, Mussulmans of Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Tripoli and Asiatic Turkey have been faithful to this observance without ever having slaughtered a cow, and I am confident no erudite Mufti can maintain that these Mussulmans have failed to observe the Sunnat (practice of the Prophet) or have been guilty of any religious shortcoming. If any Mussulman dares to call a religiously legitimate act illegitimate, he certainly commits a sin. I consider it appropriate at this stage to recount some of the *ahadees* (religious traditions) according to which the sacrifice of animals other than the cow is entitled to preference. For instance, Umma Salmah (the holy Prophet's venerable wife) says that the Prophet once observed 'if any of you see the crescent heralding the month of *Zil Hijiah* and desired to sacrifice a goat...'which obviously indicates that the tradition Arabs were in the habit of sacrificing goats. According to another our Prephet said that of all sacrificial animals sheep was preferable; if we reserve sheep alone for the offering we will be complying with this tradition. However I would refrain from expatiating on the religious aspect of this subject as, properly speaking, it relates to the domain of the doctors of theology. If having regard to all these circumstances, Mussulmans devoted their attention to this subject, of their own accord, and elected to sacrifice animals other than the cow they would have the proud privilege of being regarded the first to take the initial step towards

ensuring the internal peace of the country, and they would also, in this way, be repaying the debt of gratitude, under which they have recently been laid by their Hindu compatriots. I earnestly appeal to my Muslim brothers, to consider calmly, what I have said about this question, and if they arrive at the conclusion at which I have arrived, it will be up to them to show what value they attach to the great principle of unity and what practical response they are ready to make (with praticular reference to religious susceptibilities) to the forward step already taken by the Hindus in the direction of that goal. If I am asked to specify the practical step to be taken in this direction, I would recommend that the residents of Kashi, Ajudhia, Muthra and Bindraban (the scared places of the Hindus) should begin the operation of the principle enunciated above, and efforts should be simultaneously directed to the propagation of the same idea in other places. I must confess that it is a question which belongs to the vast and heterogeneous population of seven crore Mussulmans scattered all over India, and our efforts will take to bear fruit, but this consideration should not discourage us from making an immediate beginning. I am also of opinion, that unless some organized institution is entrusted with the propaganda, we must despair of any practical achievement in this respect. The Muslim League, of all the institutions, is by far the most suited for this purpose, and I hope it will offer itself for the sacred work, and perform it with the wisdom and zeal which it deserves. I also hope the Muslim League will receive adequate and willing co-operation from the zealous members of the Khilafat Committees. In the first place, I trust that my views on this subject will evoke no adverse criticism from any quarter, but in view of the fact that the Muslim community like all other communities of the world, is composed of men of varied ways of thinking, I shall not mind any onslaught, for I am conscious that my humble suggestions spring from the depth of honesty and sincerity and are not from any motive to please or annoy anyone.

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, KHILAFAT AND THE HOLY PLACES

Gentlemen, I now propose to deal with the question, the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. Although, Indian Muslims have expressed their views fairly and fully on verious occasions, it is my special privilege and duty, as the President of the League, to survey the entire question of the Khilafat, the Holy Places and the Ottoman Empire. In order to let the responsible ministers and the people of Great Britain have the occasion to realise the real bearings and importance of this question, we must clearly state the truth regarding the relations existing between Turkey and the Mussulmans of the world and the Indian Muslims. Islam is not merely a faith, but a system which knows no colour nor race. It teaches its followers the wholesome lesson of Muslim brotherhood, which secures for every proselyte, hailing from England, America or Africa, that equality of treatment, which is the imperishable hereitage of Mussulmans. The ordering of such a peerless

socio-religious system creates inviolable bonds between one Muslim and another. It is not a mere collection of ritual and other religious observances, but is so deeply rooted in organic ethics that any attempt to detach it from politics would amount to laying the foundation of a system wholly unlike it. According to our faith, the Prophet of Arabia, who is an example of perfection to all, presented this system as an ideal for the world, and when Providence, in His boundless wisdom, took him away from us at the conclusion of his spiritual mission, his worthy successors worked for the success of his teaching in a manner to which the chronicles written by friends and foes, and the vastness of the circle of the followers of Islam, bear adequate witness. I, however, do not feel the necessity of tracing the entire origin and development of Khilafat at this stage; for the curious can find ample materal in books of history. I shall content myself with affirming that to-day it is the descendants of Osman the great (the Ottomans), who by common acceptation are invested with the responsibility of Khilafat (spiritual sovereignty), and on account of which the entire population of the Muslim world have, ever since the day Khalifat developed on Ottoman Sovereigns, owed them that spiritual allegiance which has manifested itself to day in the acute unrest among Mussulmans all the world over. The Ottoman Sovereigns have for a long time been the custodians of the Holy Places of Islam, protecting them against non-Muslim usurpation. It is, therefore, only natural for Mussulmans to wish to see the Ottoman Empire sufficiently powerful to be able to guard the Holy Places against the nefarious designs of covetous or adventurous aliens. Turkey has, in her career in history, been the shield of Islam, having for centuries shed Turkish blood in defence of Mussulmans in various battle-fields, and has, therefore, been specially endeared to Muslims of the world. These are some of the salient reasons which explain the painful anxiety with which the Muslim world is awaiting the last word of the Peace Conference in regard to the Ottoman Empire. The Indian Muslims who have been under the British rule for more than a century, and who have furnished on several occasions undeniable proof of their practical loyalty to the British Crown, were impaled upon the horns of a most painful dilemma when war came to be declared on Turkey. They wanted to be single-minded, but while, on the one hand, they had the soundest religious scruples against going to war with or helping any one against Turkey, on the other, the adoption of a neutral position was calculated to expose them to the charge of shirking the fundamental duty they owed to their own state. Lord Hardinge, the ex-Viceroy of India, realising the acuteness of the Indian Mussulmans' predicament, made the famous announcement regarding the protection of the Holy Places with which we are all adequately familiar, and which went a long way to placate and reassure the Indian Muslims. We, then, relied on the assurance that the war between England and Turkey had nothing to do with religion, and regarded the above stated announcement as a pledge that no attempt would be made to deprive Turkey of her custody of Holy Places, and determined to help the British with

men and money. Giving our first thoughts to the allegiance we owed to the Crown, we, not merely fought against the Turks, but offered all the pecuniary assistance we possibly could for the successful prosecution of the War. Mussulmans did not play so great part in the European theateres of War, as in the battle-fields of Syria, and Mesopotamia. They fought shoulder to shoulder with the British and the Australian soldiers in the famous Dardeneles campaign, againt the Sultan of Turkey, in defence of the British Crown, and took prominent part in the service which others were rendering to the Empire. In Syria especially, of all sections of Indians, Mussulmans seem to have been most in evidence—a fact admitted by responsible persons. The Indian Muslims, who have ever been earnestly desirous to see the improvement of Turko-British relations, are painfully aware that in spite of their devout hopes to the contrary the treatment of the Turks by British statesmen has almost invariably been detrimental to the former's interests.

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS

Casting a glance at the history of the period of Anglo-Turkish alliance we first find that the vast and fertile country of Egypt passed from the real suzerainty of the Turks into virtual possession of England, after the Island of Cyprus had been ceded to England, in return for her securing lenient terms for Turkey in the treaty of Steffano, after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. The conclusion of the treaty of Berlin led the Prime Minister of Italy to address the English Premier regarding Italy's designs on Tripoli, when the latter replied that the right opportunity had not then arrived; for 'the quarry should be pursued when lame or wounded'. In 1911, long after this exchange of views, Italy invaded Tripoli and the Turks wanted to send their troops through Egypt to resist Italy's brigandage. This procedure, however, the friendly Britain successfully vetoed. On the outbreak of the last Balkan War, Mr. Asquith, the late Premier, enunciated the principle that whatever the result of the War, it should not effect the boundaries of the belligerent countries. Later on, when the tables seemed to be turning and the Turks had, owing to disorganisation, to retreat, the same upright Premier was pleased to observe that the victor could not be deprived of the fruits of his conquest. In connection with the same war, armistice was concluded just before the Turks' possession of Adrianople, when the delegates of the belligerents met under the presidency of Sir Edward now Viscount Grey (the ex-Foreign Secretary of Britain) who fully exerted his influence to secure Adrianople for the Bulgars, a demand the Turks would not concede, and Anwar Pasha followed by a large number of troops proceeded to rescue the beseiged Turkish Division with the result the Adrianople fell into Turkish hands. But Turkey's old and faithful ally Britain continued to insist on the evacuation of Adrianople. The unnameable atrocities the Greeks and Bulgars perpetrated on Macedonian Mussulmans during the Balkan War were such as to horrify any civilised people, and M. Pierr Loti, the famous French writer

profoundly moved by them reduced them to a poignantly pathetic and immortal narrative. No voice however was raised, on behalf of England against these atrocities, and no hand was stretched to succour the victims. In fact the indifference displayed on this occasion tended to encourage the appalling intentions of the Balkan tyrants.

Again it is common knowledge that Mr. Gladstone did not merely lack sympathy for the Turks, but devoted life-long endeavours to the extinction of European Turkey, and all his utterances regarding the Turks were hard-hearted and brimming with prejudice. Nor is Viscount Grey, his faithful disciple, free from this accusation, for he too has exercised his powers to the deteriment of the Turks. Although British statesmen's hostile attitude against the only recognised Muslim power seems to have been more or less consistent, the Indian Mussulmans made another effort to let bygones be bygones and placed ready reliance on the present Premier's pledge, contained in his well known speech of the 5th January, 1918. He prefaced this pledge by asserting that his utterance contained not merely the thoughts of the Government, but of the whole nation, and not merely of the nation but 'of the entire British Empire' and then proceeded to say 'nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned land of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race'. No pledge can be more unambiguous or more confident, nor can a clearer utterance be expected from the responsible minister of any other power. But the news subsequently filtered down from Paris, began to alter the features of this promise, and finally the well-known Sheffield speech of the Premier perpetrated its complete disfigurement, demonstrating to the world the fragile nature of so called 'pledges and promises', which seem to be the slaves of circumstances, changing as circumstances change. We were assured that the War would not affect the Holy Places, but we find almost all of them in non-Muslim hands to-day, and yet unsophisticated Muslims are expected to detect no violation of the promise, vouchsafed to them, in such a state of things. We Mussulmans desire it to be distinctly understood that we regard both Mecca and Medina as being in non-Muslim hand, because the Sharif himself appears to be a creature of Christendom. The other Holy Places are situated in similar or even worse circumstances. Leaving these two pledges aside we find that some of the war aims and assurances most frequently reiterated by the Allies during the period of the War were (1) that the war was waged in defence of justice and right, (2) that it was being fought for the emancipation of backward and small nations, (3) that it was not a religious struggle, but was meant to secure to all the peoples of the world (irrespective of colour or race) the blessings of justice and freedom, (4) that it was undertaken to end tyranny and aggression and to terminate the usurpation of the right of others, (5) that the vanquished were not to be dealt with severely, but would have their legitimate rights duly considered, and (6) *that there were to be no territorial annexations.*

Now it is the moral responsibility of those who propounded these aims and vouchsafed these assurances to explain to the world their real meaning as they now appear in the light of current events. Let them explain which of their pledges or aims has been satisfied or violated by permitting Greece to occupy Smyrna and its neighbouring districts and by equipping France, England and Italy with authority to hold away in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Adalia, respectively. Conscious of what they have done, they are in a better position to expound to the world the spirit which has characterised their treatment of the Ottoman Empire and Muslim rights, and they alone can state whether any Muslim nationalities have suffered any aggression and oppression or not. Will they be so good as to explain the people of this world in unequivocal terms which nationalities have been selected (irrespective of race or creed) for the fulfilment of their war aims and assurances ? Whether they conclude to justify themselves or not let the world realise the truth of it all. It is to be profoundly deplored that England's responsible minister appear determined to impair the credit which she should do all to maintain in Asia. The Asiatics too now seem prepared to give such promises the credit they deserve. Where, indeed, are the famous 'Fourteen Points' of President Wilson which the Turks and others accepted as basic principles which led first to the welcome of armistice and then to the conclusion of hostilities. Why has the para referring to Turkey, which repudiated the annexation of territory and promised 'secure sovereignty' to the Ottoman Empire over its Turkish possessions now become a dead letter. What has become of the principle of 'self-determination' ? Let those who read and relied on this principle also persue the procceding of the National Association of the Syrians, clamouring for freedom, whose voices fall on deaf ears. The majority of the Syrian population is vociferously demanding the preservation of its liberty, but tender regard for French ambition required that Syria should be delivered up to France. Is it anything but an undisguised travesty of the principle of self-determination.

TREATMENT OF TURKS DURING ARMISTICE

The pathetic narrative of the infamous treatment meted out to the Turks does not end here, for they were subjected to trying ordeals even during the period of armistice. Pressure was brought to bear on them after the cessation of hostilities to evacuate the Holy Medina with the object to hand it over to HUSAIN, the Sharif, and thus they were forcibly deprived of the last vestige of sovereignty over the Holy land, and the treacherous Greeks were suffered to land their troops at Smyran and occupy neighbouring districts about the same time. Considering that the Turks had surrendered their arms, and troops had been demobilised, the Greeks met with no resistance whatsover in achieving their nefarious end, but were encouraged to perpetrate the appalling atrocities. The Khalifat-ul-Muslimin afterwards recounted with poignant anguish in the course of an interview which he granted to an

European journalist.

His Imperial Majesty said :

'...Why should the faults of the Government be expiated through massacaring, sacking and raping thousands of peaceful inhabitants in Asia Minor by Hellenic troops, and Greek hands, whose atrocities are well-known to you ... cities are burnt, thousands of people are killed unjustly, and with the greatest ferocity. The excitement and despair amongst my people are very great. It looks as though a new war is raging already. But the terms of the armistice indirectly protect the Greeks with whom we are not at war and deprives us of every possibility of defending ourselves against their crimes. At the same time the armistice disarms us. Our troops are demobilised. Before things get worse the Powers must put an end to this butchery'.

What hard-hearted Mussulman can read those words of the *Khalifat-ul-Muslimin* without being visibly moved, and what human being can help being deeply touched by reading the graphic description of the tragic plight of His Imperial Majesty's innocent subjects. The reprisals the Turks visited upon insurgent Armenians are magnified and termed 'atrocities' and are widely circulated in Europe to exite indignation and horror against the Turks; but if the Turks themselves are the victims of barbarous atrocities by Greeks. and Armenians, the philanthropic champions of humanity close their ears against their shrieks of agony. Are we to regard this as the criterion of the superior civilisation which Europe seems to be proudly presenting as an ideal to the world ? And is this an illustration of the sublime love of humanity, of which the cultured nations complacently boast ? Time and again we are confidently assured that religious prejudice does not weigh with Europe. But the trend of events proves the contrary. Turkey has not committed the slightest breach of the terms of the armistice, and yet she has been subjected to the kind of treatment detailed above, whereas perfidious Italy has defiantly trampled under foot the decision of the Peace Conference regarding, Fiume, and still her violent affront is patiently tolerated. Again Romania, a much smaller State than Italy, in spite of being guilty of unmitigated brigandage in Hungery, has consistently treated the demands of the council as unworthy of notice, thus behaving with unbridled defiance of international obligations but her audacious recalcitrance is met with dignified toleration, possibly because she is a Christian State. Emphatic claims are being put forward for the 'mandatory' control of Turkish provinces, but faithless and backward Bulgaria is considered fit not merely to enjoy full freedom, but to have an 'outlet to the Sea', although she, too, threw in her lot with Germany and fought against the Allies along said of the Turks (without the admittedly clean methods of the latter). Nor is this all to complete the malencholy tale of religious prejudice against the Turks, for there are still other events which drive the point home. The Premier while decorating General Allenby with an order commemorating the conquest of Palestine, preferred to call the Palestinian campaign a 'crusade' reviving the more or less forgotten the

centuries old memories of a series of religious hostilities between the Christians and the Muslims. The resuscitation by the Prime Minister of this obsolescent term implies that the Power of Christendom have not yet allowed the old memories to abate, and it is a mistake to regard the ancient series of crusades as terminated, since in winning the latest 'crusade' General Allenby the Richard II of his time, has rendered Christendom that distinguished service which even His Royal Predecessor failed to accomplish. Can we ask the minister, who has rescued the centuries old term 'crusade' from oblivion, if according to him the Indian Muslim and unfortunate Arabs bled and died on the Syrian battlefield to win a battle which this second Richard won with the help of troops, two thirds of which were Moslem, to be called a 'crusade' afterwards ? Let these ministers remember that their present policy, and such flagrant indiscretions as the one just described are not merely a subtle source of pain to the seven and a half crores of Mussulmans of India, but are calculated to sow the seeds of a potential estrangement throughout the Moslem world, which if suffered to grow may not prove conducive to calm contemplation of the undesirable results likely to follow.

In spite of all this the Indian Muslims have not swerved from the path of duty, and have remained firmly loyal; It is confidently hoped that they will continue to display in the future the patience they have so far shown, and unflinchingly adhere to their primary civic duty. But how is the Government discharging the responsibilities with which it is burdened on behalf of the Mussulmans ? Let us consider the concrete 'acts' which answer this query.

The Peace Conference, which undertook the grave duty of pronouncing a final decision regarding not merely some Muslim peoples, but virtually regarding the entire Muslim world, proceeded with its onerous work without consulting a single Muslim representative. It was not considered necessary to observe the elementary principle of hearing the party, the question of whose life and death had to be decided and it has not yet been considered proper to admit a Muslim representative to the Conference with which rests the pronouncements of the final verdict on Islam. We are cognisant that His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner and Mr. Montague represented what Indian Muslim wished to the best of their ability before the Peace Conference, and we are deeply grateful to both of them. But may we know what objection there could possibly be to the selection of a Muslim representative ? And why, indeed, was so modest and legitimate a demand of Indian Muslims relegated to the scrapheap ? The request made to the Prime Minister for receiving a deputation to present the views of Indian Muslims met with a cold reception, for the Premier was not ready to waste his precious time in listening to such useless matters. In the end memorialisation was resorted to, although without securing any satisfactory assurance. We are thankful to His Excellency Lord Chelmsford for the reference he made to this subject in

his opening address to the Imperial Council, in its September Session of 1919, when he assured the Indian Muslims that he had done his best to represent the feelings and views of Indian Muslims to the Secretary of State. We must also thankfully acknowledge His Excellency's allusion to Indian Mussulmans acute anxiety regarding the question of Turkey, contained in the speech he made on the 24th November last, at Madras. He said 'I realise to the full and sympathise most deeply with the anxiety felt by all Muslims in India regarding the result of the negotiation of peace with Turkey. Knowing how strong those feelings are I took measures to secure that their views should be represented fully to the Home Government and to the authorities assembled at the Peace Conference. Special Muslim representatives were delegated to Paris to attend the Peace Conference, and whatever may be the result of these negotiations, and this must depend on factors which affect interests other than those of India or England, Indian Muslims may rest assured that their feelings have been fully represented. You may have noticed that Mr. Boner Law speaking in the House of Commons on 3rd November said that the British Government was fully aware of the interest of Indian Mahommedans in the future of Turkey and that they would give as they had already given full weight and consideration to their views'. We, however, find no word either in His Excellency's or in Mr. Bonar Law's utterances which may allay the anxiety we feel. In fact no responsible representative of His Majesty either here or in England has yet permitted himself to breathe a word which may even savour of the assurance we Mussulmans of India are awaiting with bated breath. We are fully aware that the result of the peace negotiation with Turkey depends on factors which affect interests other than those of Britain nor are we blind to French or Italian interests of which the former seem to figure prominently in the considerations likely to determine England's attitude. We are, at the same time, tolerably certain that England's will be the decisive voice in the final settlement with Turkey, and therefore we are constrained to regard what may follow these negotiations as the result of England's strength or weakness. If England realised the true significance and friendly feelings of more than 30 crores Muslims of the world as against the comparatively paltry economic advantages to be derived from Mesopotamia, she would display less solicitude for the interests of France and Italy and secure just and honourable settlement with Turkey ushering in a wholly new era: We are sincerely thinkful to Mr. Montague for undertaking the responsibility of correctly interpreting our views to the Peace Conference. In one of his speeches he was good enough to observe that he and his colleagues (Lord Sinha and H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner) insisted before the Council of the Four that nothing short of a just settlement on the basis of nationality would satisfy the Muslims, nor was any other settlement possible that indeed, would satisfy the Mussulmans; but surely a 'settlement on the basis of 'nationality' cannot possibly imply that England and France should become the rulers of Arabia under the specious pretext of

holding a 'mandate', a new fangled invention bequeathed by the late war. Nor can that principle be said to have been respected by exposing Smyrna to the tyranny of the Greeks. The Muslims will be satisfied only when independence (in the true sense of the term) is secured to the Arabs and other Turkish subjects by assigning to Turkey the 'mandate' to administer their provinces subject to the supervision of a League of Nations not swayed by more than one vote of each country. The Muslims know that the right to hold a Mandate (if mandatory government is at all necessary) in any of the lands previously under the Ottoman rule primarily belongs to Turkey, because the people inhabiting these lands are predominantly Muslim in faith, and no non-Muslim power can under any pretext have the right to hold sway over them. The Mussulmans cannot be expected to forget that these lands have been the cradle of Islam, where the Holy Places are situated, and where no non-Muslim can ever have even the semblance of the right of mandatory or any other rule. Trampling upon Muslim sentiments in this respect would mean creating not transitory but perennial unrest in the entire Muslim world, which would otherwise mean the deliberate awakening of unfriendly feelings in an otherwise unobtrusive people.

DIFFERENCE OF MUSLIM AND NON-MUSLIM CONCEPTION OF KHILAFAT

In his speech already referred to, we find Mr. Montague assuring his Muslim fellow subjects that no word had been used during the discussions at Paris, officially or otherwise, to show that any one was foolish enough to comtemplate meddling with the question of Khilafat, which was purely for the Mussulmans to determine. Nor did he think the Holy Places or any sacred building were at the time in any danger to require interference. The first portion of this utterance is far from reassuring the Mahommedans. We are not appealing to any one to refrain from interfering with that aspect of the question which is a matter of faith; for we know all the powers of earth are not puissant enough to change the religious convictions of any people. I can imagine no one to be so foolish as to ground his appeal to Britain on so obvious a misconception. On the contrary our representations are based on the ground that 'temporal power' is the chief factor of Khilafat, which it is feared, will be destroyed by dismembering the Ottoman Empire as contemplated. The Khilafat must not be reduced to the postion of His Holiness the Pope at Rome, with his influence extending to spiritual confines only. And again I am unable to understand the import of the second portion of his assurance regarding the immunity of the Holy Places. Who, indeed, is the real ruler of Hijaz, (where Mecca and Medina, the cities of the Prophet are situated) behind Husain the Sharif, and who are holding and admininistering Baitul-Muqqadas (Holy Jerusalem), Karbala, Najaf-i-Ashraf, Kazmain-Sharifan, Baghdad and other places, in fact the whole of Jaziratul-Arab (the entire region, where the Holy Places by non-Muslims does not spell danger to them, it is difficult to assign any meaning to the word.

OBLIGATIONS ACKNOWLEDGED

It would be rank ingratitude if we failed to acknowledge the eminent services rendered to Islam by some of the high souled Englishmen, who have proved that England is not destitute of men, ready to espouse any cause based on righteousness and justice, and in this connection the names of Mr. Marmaduke Pitthall, Captain Aubrey Herbert, M. P., Sir Theodore Morrison and Professor E G. Browne are worthy of special mention, and the fair and sympathetic attitude of Mr. C. F. Andrews and some other Britishers entitles them to our thanks. I may, at this stage, take the liberty of reproducing below some valuable excerpts from a speech Mr. Pitthall recently delivered dealing with this difficult Muslim problem. He said :

'They say the Turkish Empire has already been abominably mis-governed. Well, I know Turkey pretty well and I declare that there was less discontent per head of the population in the Turkish Empire even in the worst of times than there has been in the British Empire at any time in my remembrance.' In reference to Armenian massacres he says : 'They talk of horrid massacres from time to time. These massacres have never been on one side only. They were owing to seditious propaganda organised by powers of Europe—chiefly Russia. And I say that any state even the most civilised, subjected to the kind of treatment Turkey has received from Russia and other European powers for a century would show precisely the same symptoms as Turkey has shown. You cannot thrust claws into a living frame without convulsions.'

Then dealing with the change that the Turks were pro-German he states in categorical terms ...In 1913, the Young Turks wished that England should assume the instructorship of the whole Ottoman Empire, the army included, for the ten years. Their object was, of course, to get protection against the designs of other European powers during a period of reconstruction and reform. *The mere suggestion was refused.*' He continues ; 'The man, like Enver Pasha, who had voted for the suggestion as a forlorn hope, said : You see they dare not act alone. England has become the tail of Russia, She has sunk to the position of a third class power. The only chance which now remains to us is Germany. Further he says : 'The pro-British part of the Committee (of Union and progress)—the majority—were disappointed, but still persisted. They kept whittling down the offer, seeking to make it acceptable till it amounted to no more than a request that England would provide a certain number of Inspectors for Armenia, to superintend the reforms which the Turks were trying to push forward to those provinces against the whole force of Tsarist intrigue. The force of that intrigue in Eastern Anatolia all through 1913–14 amounted to a state of war. The Tsarist agents were using all the means at their disposal, and they had much larger means than the poor Turks possessed, to discredit the Turkish Government. They tried to work up wholesale massacres of Moslems and Armenians quite indifferently—massacres

which were to serve as pretext for the Russian occupation of the country-massacres which the Turks did all they could do to prevent. Western Europe could not be brought to believe that Russian intrigue was what it was—so barefaced, so ruthless, and the Young Turks thought that if they could get Englishmen in charge of those provinces, England at any rate would be bound to know and believe. England was bound to help them in Armenia by the terms of the Cyprus Convention. Well, that request was granted, as we all believed. It was refused months later suddenly; if these English Inspectors had been sent to Eastern Anatolia, if England had not turn up a 'Scrap of paper, the last Armenian massacres would not have taken place.' A clean consideration of all these matters leads to the one inference, which has been embodied in the foregoing words.

PERSIA AND THE ANGLO-PERSIAN AGREEMENT

The plight of Turkey was nearly enough to break the hearts of Indian Muslims, whom news of the Anglo-Persian Agreement (calculated, in our opinion, to seal the doom of another Muslim Power) proved to be the load of Indian Muslims' anxiety.

Persia in her palmy days was source of culture and enlightenment to Indian Muslims and they are deeply indebted to her. Having regard to the lines along with their social, traditional and literary development has proceeded the Indian Mussulmans cannot help entertaining a grateful regard for and calling Persian their 'kind, old teacher'. I have already said that 'brotherhood' (or the fundamental relationship which knits together the entire Muslims family of the world) is the cardinal principle of Islam, and therefore moved by feelings which suffuse the consciousness of the Mussulmans (as a result of the intense realisation of that teaching), they cannot help being gratified or grieved, as the case may be, at the preservation and prosperity or the decay and extinction of Muslim States. These feelings and sentiments, springing from the 'Fundamentals' of Islam, remain uneffected by unessential differences of various pursuasions. We, therefore, observe that the *Shia* section of Mussulmans, whose views regarding the essentials of the question of Khilafat do not coincide with those of the *Sunnis*, are intensely interested in the preservation of the Sultan's temporal power as they could possibly be in the welfare of *Iran* (Persia); and the entire *Sunni* and *Shias* and all other followers of Islam, are equally interested in and own spiritual kingship with them, and that is why Indian Muslims are deeply affected by the Agreement, recently concluded between the British Government and Iran. The latter seems to have been the object of the former's attentions, on account of her (Persia's) being a neighbour of India, and those attentions have long been materialising in the form of a definite policy. Persia has been for years the object of English and Russian diplomacy, aiming at the extension or restriction of respective 'sphere of influence' and as a consequence of this, all the hopes of a prosperous future, raised during the latest period of her evolutional struggle,

were dashed to the ground. A severe blow was dealt to the hope of her economic development by causing the resignation of Mr. Shuster, her well-wisher; her political freedom had been imperilled to the point of extinction by the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1909. However, the great European War, whose painful aftermath is not over yet, resulted in the termination of the said agreement, because Kerenshky's Government declared it unconscionable and invalid. Had the Russian withdrawal been followed by the British withdrawal, Persia would have been the recipient of blessing. But now it appears that responsible British statesmen were awaiting the end of war, and no sooner any favourable results made their appearance than they began to bestow attention upon Persia, finally securing the conclusion of the agreement under review.

We are now compelled to look upon Persia as the Egypt of Asia. We fully expect English capitalists to construct railways and roads for motor services. And we may be sure to see the Finance Deptt. completely overhauled, the audacity of men given to speculation materially pruned, agriculture largely improved, oil fields worked by more capable men, but it appears that in regard to the factors on which depends the evolutional development of the Persian people, Persian's hands and feet are in danger of being bound. Persia may now cease to have any conception of political liberty, and despair of working the resources of the country or accomplishing any real economic development with the aid of the country's capital. Henceforth Persia will be obliged to maintain a very low standard of education, and will be so juxtaposed as to be obliged to relieve her officials of much of the burden of their responsibility, as a consequence of which their efficiency will be undermined, and she will be constrained to depend on some other Power for a supply of experts, and all these facts will contribute to the disappearance of her real freedom.

THE ANGLO-PERSIAN AGREEMENT

Apropos of the Anglo-Persian Agreement which is talked about in Europe and Asia to-day, I may give below the jist of some of the articles which throw light on the nature of this Agreement.

By article I of Part I of the Agreement, (in so far as the parchment is concerned on which the agreement is indicted) the Government of Great Britain 'reiterates in the most categorical manner possible' the undertaking 'to respect absolutely the independence and integrity of Persia', and thereby in a way incur a responsibility; and according to the second and the third articles it undertakes 'to supply, at the cost of the Persian Government', advisers and experts 'for the several departments of the Persian Administration', including, of course, Finance and Military Departments. These two articles vitally react on the first; for if the Persian Government is committed to entrusting her Military and Finance to British advisers and specialists, it is obvious that the agreement reaches down to the very root of Persia's independence other-

wise guaranteed in the first article. The third article further stipulates, on behalf of Great Britain, the supply of 'officers' munitions and equipment of modern type at the cost of the Persian Government', thereby relieving Persia of much of the difficulty she might otherwise have encountered. Then Persia was granted a loan of £ 2 000,000 from England on interest at 7% per annum, payable by instalments in 20 years, and by way of security of repayment she assigns to England the receipts of all the revenues and customs of various provinces; England also assumes the responsibility of co-operating with the Persian Government in 'encouraging Anglo-Persian enterprize' by means of 'construction of railways and other forms of transport', thus enhancing the means of and facilitating communication. Further, Sir Percy Cox has secured the relinquishment by the Persian Government of any claim she might otherwise have made to be indemnified for the damage 'caused by the British troops during their presence in Persian territory' and, as a token on reciprocal return, the British Government has agreed to claim no 'cost for the maintenance of the said troops sent to Persia owing to Persia's want of power to defend her neutrality.'

If Persia, in her anxiety to defend her neutrality, requested the British Government to send British troops, she certainly cannot fairly claim any indemnity for any damage caused by the troops, and not to burden her exchequer with the cost of the maintenance of these troops must necessarily be regarded as an act of obliging generosity, but if the presence of British troops in Persia was a strategic and ineluctable necessity dictated by foresight in regard to the defence of India on the one hand and the provision against the enemy descending by way of Persia on the advanced troops in Mesopotamia on the other. I fear the securing of the relinquishment of her claim by Persia can hardly be based on fairness.

In fine, the complex problems connected with Turkey's present plight, and the virtual extinction of Persia's freedom, are some of the most fruitful and potent causes of the present unrest throughout the Muslim world, which, in my humble opinion does not derive sustenance from sources of a temporary nature, because it lies down in the depth of faith, and its temporary abatement should not be treated as a sign of its complete subsidence. It has, as we are all aware, brought the Khilafat Committee into temporary existence to voice the true Moslem feelings and to secure the just treatment of Turkey and the preservation of the integrity of Persian independence. It is hoped that they will continue to respect the ethical duty imposed upon them as subjects of the Government, whose protection they enjoy, while banishing all hesitancy and timidity, in giving fearless expression to their views—all within constitutional limits—during this crisis and after. May the Khilafat Committee succeed to achieving what they have come into existence for and may it not be found necessary to perpetuate or prolong their existence.

NON PARTICIPATION IN PEACE CELEBRATIONS

Gentlemen, allow me here to say a few words regarding the abstention of the Muslims from the official Peace Celebrations. The Muslims of India along with other Indians would have willingly and enthusiastically participated in the celebration, whatever its form if the cessation of the war concluded in favour of the Allies had brought real peace and tranquility in its train. But at a time when the only surviving Muslim power appeared to be in imminent peril of being absorbed and the Muslim Holy Places had been weaned from Muslim custody, their abstention from the celebration could hardly be viewd as an unjustified. Their religion forbade any participation in such a rejoicing, and whenever there is any conflict between the command of their faith and the wishes of the officials their first duty will be to obey the former which no earthly consideration can possibly override.

GRATEFULNESS TO THE HINDUS AND MAHATMA GANDHI

In this respect we, Mussulmans, are deeply grateful to the Hindus for sharing our sorrow with sincere willingness, and giving enthusiastic expressions to their sympathetic feelings. The abstention of Hindus from peace celebrations (which included the suspension of business for some time in the evening for 3 or 4 days, and co-operating with Mussulmans in observing the directions issued by the Anti-Peace Celebrations Publicity Board), out of regard among other things, for Moslem sentiments, has made a deep impression on the Mussulmans and I trust the spirit which has achieved this result will continue to operate in the interest of preserving the impression created. At the same time I confindently trust that the Mussulmans will, in future, willingly co-operate with their fellow countrymen in all matters which may be of special and exclusive interest to the latter. I cannot at this stage help mentioning the revered name of Mahatma Gandhi, an acknowledged leader of our country, whose active sympathy springing as it did from the depth of unalloyed sincerity and a correct conception of righteous action, has won him the grateful and reverential affection of all Mussulmans of India. If thankfulness can be expressed in words, let me in the name of the Indian Muslim community thank the Hindus and Mahatma Gandhi from the bottom of my heart.

Permit me, now, to say a word about the unfortunate Muslim and other internees, whose sufferings in exile have not known abatement in spite of the termination of the war. It seems as if the question of the release of our *Peswa* (revered guide), Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hassan, and our brothers, Messrs. Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, has ceased to engage the attention of the Government. The Mussulmans after having done what was possible for them to do, and failed to secure the early release of these devotees to the national cause, were hoping that after cessation of the war the Government would, at an early date, turn its

attention to the question of releasing the internees – a hope doomed to disappointment. If, however, this listlessness of the Government continues it will be time for a systematic public movement to draw the attention of the Government to this question. It is, however, devoutly hoped that such a necessity will not arise, and the Government will be found ready to reconsider the question of their release, and terminate the painful period of their separation from us.

LAST WORD

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am sorry to have occupied much of your valuable time, but the singular gravity of the present crisis in the Muslim world, and the vital questions arising out of the Punjab situation compelled me to linger on the points dealt with in my address, even to the exclusion of some other important problems. I sincerely thank you for the patient hearing you have accorded me, and crave your indulgence for the omissions and shortcomings patent on the face of my humble although honest and sincere submission. I am aware that the exceptional nature of the events now happening in the Muslim world has led me to dwell at length on topics of exclusively Muslim interest, but I have done so advisedly and in the confident hope that it cannot, at this time of day, lead any one to doubt the vivid cosceiousness of the Mussulmans of the solemn duty they owe to their motherland. As children of the soil, they know and fervently desire to fulfil their duty to the country of which they, in common with Hindus, Christians, Parsis and other communities, are the proud inheritors. They have, I can assure all concerned, realised to the full the solemn call of the Motherland, and the sacred duty of patriotism. I am proud to declare that the time has come when the necessity for exhorting people to live up to the highest standards of patriotism is rapidly diminishing: for the mysterious tide of human progress to pushing its sweep forward, and the humblest being to becoming conscious of how to live and die for higher ideals. For India the unseen future holds a magnificence and splendour compared with which the most glorious grandeur of her past will be but small. Let all hands of men as well as of women join to unveil that vision.

The revised draft constitution of the League was then taken into consideration and slight changes introduced. The next two or three resolutions were then passed and at that stage came Messrs. Mahommed Ali and Shaukat Ali. At once the huge gathering stood upon their feet and greated their beloved leaders now returned after long years of cruel internment with a reverberating chorus of joy. For the time resolutions were dropped and the great Ali Brothers were pressed to speak. They then addressed the meeting and the audience was moved to tears.

The League than adjourned and met again next day to pass the remaining resolutions. After the usual thanks givings the session came to close.

43

ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE RESOLUTIONS OF AMRITSAR SESSION. 1919

The following resolutions were adopted at the Amritsar session (1919) of the All India Muslim League :

1. The All-India Muslim League tenders its homage to the person and throne of His Majesty the King Emperor and assures him of the steadiest and continued loyalty of the Mussulman community of India.

2. That this meeting of All-India Muslim League places on record its sense of deep loss which Community has sustained by the sad and untimely death of the late Sheik Mahommad Umar, Bar-at-Law of Amritsar, and Secretary Anjuman Taraqqi Talim Mussulman, Amritsar.

3. This meeting of the All-India Muslim League expresses its sense of deep grief at the sad and untimely demise of the late Nawab Syed Mahommad of Madras.

4. This session of the All-India Muslim League while thanking the Governor of Bombay for announcing in Council strict neutrality of the Government in religious matters and for issuing a public warning to the effect, strongly urges the necessity of setting an enquiry by H. E. the Governor into the complaints of improper conduct of certain Sindh officials in connection with Khilafat question.

5. That in view of a strong desire of the Muslim community to have definite provisions for the protection of its interest, this League urges upon Government that the following safeguards be adopted in the forthcoming Reforms – (a) The Mussulmans should be adequately represented in the public services of the country; (b) The Mussulmans should have representation in the administration in the same proportion as the representation accorded to the Mussulmans on the Legislative Council in the province concerned; (c) The Urdu Language and Persian character should be maintained in courts and public offices in those provinces where they are in vogue and Urdu should be employed as the medium of primary education in the aforesaid provinces; (d) That the Mussulmans should be afforded facilities, protection and help in the observance and performance of their religious rites and ceremonies and usages without any restriction.

The All-India Muslim League resolves that the All-India Congress Committee be asked to appoint a Committee at an early date to confer with the Committee of the Council of the League in order to arrive at an understanding on questions arising out of the Reforms Act, 1919, and the demand for complete self-government.

6. Dr. Ansari next moved a resolution expressing the League's opinion

that with a views to reciprocate the good feelings shown towards Mussulmans by the Hindu brethren and to strengthen the growing unity between them and the Mussulmans of India, the Mussulmans should on the occasion of Bakr-Id festival substitute as far as possible the sacrifice of other animals in place of cows.

THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION

7. The following resolution was then put from the chair : The All-India Muslim League representing eighty million Muslim subjects of His Majesty King George V, the Emperor of India, expresses its sense of gratitude for the spirit in which the Royal proclamation had been addressed to the princes and people of India on the occasion of giving the Royal assent to the Government of India Act, 1919. The League trusts that the rights of the Indian people to direct their own affairs and safeguard their interests, without which the progress of the country cannot be consummated, will be secured before long under His Majesty's loving sympathy, and earnestly joins in His Majesty's prayer that India may grow to the fulness of political freedom in the near future. Further the League feels confident that the Royal clemency in granting general amnesty to political prisoners and detenues would go far to remove the bitterness existing between the people and those responsible for government of the country, and lastly the League assure His Imperial Majesty of cordial and hearty welcome which the people of India would accord to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales during his visit to this country in the coming winter.

PUNJAB DISTURBANCES

The Hon. Mr. Syed Raza Ali next moved the following resolution which was carried :

8. In view of the fact that the enquiry in the Punjab disturbances is yet pending, this meeting of the All-India Muslim League refrains from expressing its opinion in the matter at this stage but cannot help drawing the serious attention of the British Parliament to the shocking disclosures made by General Dyer in his evidence before the Hunter Committee in the hope that Parliament will take early steps to see that justice and British reputation for fairness are fully vindicated

IMPEACHMENT OF DYER AND O'DWYER

9. The Hon. Maulvi Abdul Kasim then moved :

(1) This meeting of the All-India Muslim League is of opinion that in view of the admissions made by General Dyer in his statement before the Hunter Committee, he is not fit to remain in command and should be immediately relieved of his duty as a preliminary to legal proceedings being taken against him.

(2) This meeting of the All-India Muslim League is of opinion that

the entire policy of Sir Michael O'Dwyer is under enquiry and in view also of the fact that he approved of General Dyer's cold blooded and calculated massacre in the Jallianwala Bagh, he should be relieved of his connection with the Army Commission as a preliminary to legal proceedings being taken against him.

The resolution was agreed to.

VICEROY'S RECALL

10. Mr. Mumtaz Hussain moved : This meeting of the All-India Muslim League is of opinion that H. E. Lord Chelmsford has forfeited the confidence of all sections of the Indian population and he should immediately be recalled from India.

The speaker said that the passing of the resolution was highly essential for the future welfare of the country. Lord Chelmsford's regime had been particularly noted for its reactionary attempts to suppress Indian aspirations. To give effect to the Reform Scheme the head of the Government ought to have more liberal ideals and it was doubtful whether Lord Chelmsford would really put Indians on the way to self-government. The indifference shown by His Excellency's Government to respect public opinion expressed by public leaders as a protest against the Rowlatt Act had shaken their faith in his Government. It was nothing but the flouting of public opinion.

GENERAL AMNESTY

The following resolutions were then moved one after another and carried :

11. In view of the fact that full effect has not yet been given to the general amnesty clause of the gracious proclamation of His Majesty the King Emperor and that persons in the Punjab, tried by Martial Law commissioners, summary courts, area officers and tribunals constituted under the Defence of India Act, and detenues and deportees have not been released, this meeting of the All-India Muslim League expresses the earnest hope and trusts that the fullest effect will immediately be given to the letter and spirit of the Royal Command.

DEVOTION TO KHALIFA

12. This meeting of the All-India Muslim League shares with the entire Muslim world the wide belief that His Imperial Ottoman Majesty, Sultan Waheeduddin, is the recognised Khalifa of Islam and places on record its deep-seated and unshakeable devotion to the sacred person of His Imperial Majesty as a successor of the Prophet and the head of Islam.

DISMEMBERMENT OF TURKEY

13. This meeting of the All-India Muslim League expresses its disappointment at the disregard shown by the British Government to the

repeated representation made by Indian Mussulmans through their representatives in England and India regarding the question of Khilafat, holy places and Jazirat-ul-Arab and feels constrained to express that no settlement contemplating the dismemberment of Turkey would ever satisfy Indian Mussulmans but keep them in a state of perpetual dissatisfaction and discontent, for the grave consequences of which they shall not be responsible. Under the circumstances the Mussulmans would be fully justified to carry on all possible methods of constitutional agitation open to them including boycott of the British army if it is likely to be used outside India for Imperial or anti-Islamic purposes.

SYMPATHY WITH EGYPTIAN NATIONALISTS

14. The All-India Muslim League expresses its deep sympathy with the political aspirations of the nationalists of Egypt to get the principle of self-determination applied to their country in accordance with the terms of the Peace Conference and is grieved at the methods adopted to thwart their ambitions.

INADEQUACY OF REFORMS

15. While fully appreciating the labours of the Right Hon. Edwin Samuel Montague, Secretary of State for India, in connection with the Government of India Act of 1919, the All-India Muslim League deeply regrets that full responsible government for which India is fit has been withheld both in the provinces and in the Central Government and that the principle of self-determination has not been applied to her in accordance with her demands. It, therefore, considers the Reforms inadequate and unsatisfactory and trusts that Parliament will establish full responsible government of India at the earliest opportunity. In the meantime the League calls upon Indians to demonstrate their capacity for complete self-government by availing themselves of such opportunity as is now offered to them in reforms recently enacted which the League recognises to be a definite step towards the goal of full responsible government.

LIBERTY OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION

16. This meeting of the All India Muslim League places on record its deep-seated belief that the new era ushered in by the gracious Royal proclamation cannot bear fruit unless and until full liberty of thought and expression is granted to the people of India, and the various restrictions placed on that liberty by the manner in which the Press Act has been and is being administered and the various other obstacles placed upon Indian journalism in general and Muslim journals in particular are immediately removed.

SEPARATE REPRESENTATION

17. That the All-India Muslim League voicing the Muslim public opinion adheres to the principle of separate representation for the Muslim community and strongly urges upon the Government the immediate necessity of applying the said principle to local bodies in provinces where it has not yet been applied.

REPEAL OF REPRESSIVE ACTS

18. That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League urges on the attention of the Government the imperative necessity of repealing the Press Act, the Defence of India Act and the Rowlatt Act.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1920.

44

MEMORIAL PRESENTED TO MR. LLOYD GEORGE BY THE MUSLIMS IN ENGLAND THROUGH THE ISLAMIC SOCIETY, LONDON

5 January 1920

We, representing the Muslims, beg to place a few observations before you in order that peace with the Ottoman Empire and the Caliphate should be concluded on principles of justice, in accordance with the pledges given to the Muslim world and in a spirit free from bigotry.

The Turks are accused of having gone to war with the *Entente*. This is contrary to fact and the lessons taught by history. Whenever Russia has gone to war with any nation she has always fomented trouble in Turkey, or forced her to go to war with some other people. It is needless to dilate upon this well-known historical fact, as a reference to any history dealing with Turkish affairs will furnish the instances.

(1) The Convention between England and France in respect of Morocco, followed by (2) a Convention between England and Russia in respect of Persia, without the consent of the latter, and (3) the high-handed way in which Russia acted, followed by (4) a war in the Balkans, forced upon Turkey at a time when she was holding an election, (5) threat of invasion by Russia if election was held, (6) the assistance given to the Balkan States by Russia and the sanction given by England before and the support after the war, (7) refusal of England to publish Consular reports on the atrocities commited by the Balkan Christians upon unarmed Turkish civil population, followed

by (8) confiscation in the guise of commandeering of the two Turkish Dreadnoughts and the appeal to England by the Turkish Ministers not to resort to such extreme measures, followed by (9) concentration of troops by Russia on the Turkish frontier in consonance with the policy which forbade the Turks from building railways there, followed by (10) an invasion by Russia and the appeal to England by the Turkish Ministers to arbitrate and (11) the refusal by England and declaration of war instead by her upon Turkey, led many to an irresistible conclusion that a general policy for the destruction of all non-Christian States was secretly decided upon, and the wars which subsequently followed were planned beforehand. The famous meeting at Reval, dealing with the Turkish question, renders the conclusion almost certain. In view of the facts that an Entente existed between the Muslims and England and the Muslim British subjects were supporting England and the friendship that existed between England and Turkey from the time of Queen Elizabeth, such a policy was wanton. The present Sultan of Turkey, the Khalipha of the Muslims, as soon as he came to the throne offered peace to England, but it was refused. Thus it is apparent that the war was forced upon Turkey in conformity with the plan decided upon long before, and that the Turks fought in self-defence. No blame, therefore, could be attached to them. Certainly they did not fight to rob their neighbours of their territories as is now alleged.

CHARGE OF CRUELTY AGAINST TURKS UNFOUNDED

The charge of cruelty levelled against the Turks is unfounded. We have made inquiries from officers and soldiers and find that they never ill-treated their prisoners wilfully. Nor did they ever pollute wells and other watercourses. They fought in a clean manner, and treated the British and French soldiers with the great consideration and friendship. Many British soldiers have testified to this fact, although stories of cruelty are circulated by interested persons. Absurd statements about the Turks possessing no culture, no scientific knowledge, etc., have been made in the columns of the British Press, and correction or exposure of the ignorance thereof refused publication.

MESSACRE OF HALF A MILLION MUSLIMS BY THE GREEKS IN THE BALKANS AND CRETE

Nor are the other charges preferred against the Turks true. It cannot now be denied that during the Balkan War more than half a million Turkish unarmed men, women, and children were butchered in cold blood, their properties burnt down or looted away, and outrages of which even a savage should be ashamed were perpetrated by the Balkan Christians. Forcible conversion or extinction of certain Muslim population of European Turkey was resorted to in defiance of all laws known to mankind. Place of worship were outraged, desecrated, or destroyed. Of murders in Macedonia prior to

the Balkan War Lord Lamington and Hon. Walter Guinness, M.P., pointed out that, in 1908, 1663 murders were committed by the Christians as against 474 alleged to have been committed in self-defence. Some hundred thousand Muslims were turned out of Nish and Veranya, dispossessed of their property without compensation and driven out of Servia to die of hunger and starvation. In 1821 all the Muslims in the Morea and many thousands in northern parts of Greece were massacred by the Greeks, the first of the series of massacres which shocked the students of the Eastern question in the nineteenth century. In Crete, the home of Venizelos, there were some 49,000 Muslims, but they have nearly all been murdered by the Greeks. The massacre of the Muslims in Kurdistan by the Armenian Christians is now too well known to be concealed any longer, and that by the Greeks in the Balkans and Asia Minor are, in spite of all partisanship shown by the followers of Christ, accepted as true. Prior to the Balkan War there was no question of any massacre by the Greeks, nor was it during the Balkan War, as the Greek member of the deputation from Thrace, as well as many Greeks, have rightly pointed out to us that there was no question of any Greek trouble in Turkey and that they were happy and contented. If anything, Turks were massacred by the Greeks, and mosques and houses desecrated and burnt down. To accuse the Turks of everything and anything is traditional, and the support given to it in England a well-known fact. Silence and evasion on the horrors of massacre of Muslims in Macedonia by the Christians raised a strong presumption that barbarous conduct in the Balkan War was in principle prearranged.

MUSLIMS MASSACRED DURING VENIZELOS REGIME

During the period M. Venizelos had been in power and paying a round of visits to the politicians in England, some thousands of Muslims have been deliberately massacred. The fact is now admitted. Who is reponsible for it ?

MASSACRES BY ARMENIANS SUPPRESSED

Stories about the massacres of the Armenians have also been purposely exaggerated and falsely circulated. No mention is made of the massacre of the Kurds and of the Turks by the Armenians. Prior to the seventies there was no Armenian questions, but it came into prominence when England regained the right under a Convention to be in Cyprus. All these, it appears, have been purposely circulated for similar purposes, and therefore should not affect the right of the Turks to include in its fold the Government of Kurdistan, miscalled Turkish Armenia.

CHRISTIANS IN TURKEY HAVE ALWAYS HAD SECURITY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY

Christian races under the Turkish rule are said to have no security of lives and property. This charge is also traditional. The great prosperity of the Ottoman Christians and their continued existence in such numbers as

found now in Bulgaria, Greece, Servia, Romania, once provinces of Turkey, and in other parts of the Turkish empire and the alleged massacre extending over a few centuries, prove the falsity of the charge.

TOLERATION THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Toleration and respect for other faiths besides Islam have always been the guiding factor in the Turkish policy. This is in strict accordance with the Koran.

1. Do no violence to men on account of their faith. The way of salvation is well distinguished from the path of error. (Koran, II 256).

2. All Muslims, Jews, Christians, and Pagans who believe in God and the future life and who do good work will receive recompense at His hands. They will be free from fear and torture. (Koran, II, 50).

3. Argue with Jews and Christians only in respectful, moderate language, say, we believe in the doctrine of Moses, of Jesus, and the Prophets, we set up no difference among them, and we are Muslims (Koran, II, 120, 130; III, 77).

4. Say to the Jews and Christians, the true light comes from heaven; everyone has received his part of it as you have. (Koran, III, 56).

EQUALITY OF ALL OTTOMANS-DOCUMENTS

The Hatte-Houmayoun of 1856, the Magna Charta of the Ottoman, and Arts, 8, 11, 19 of the Ottoman Constitution, on December 23, of 1856, lay all Ottoman subjects on terms of equality in point of religion, politics, and employment. In the present Ottoman Parliament, Muslims and non-Muslims are fully represented, and voters have exercised their rights irrespective of the faith of the candidates.

GREEK AND ARMENIAN PATRIARCHS : NO DIFERENCE IN PARLIAMENT

The establishment and existence of the Greek and Armenian patriarchs and the Jewish rabbiates conclusively show the spirit in which the Ottoman Empire is governed.

PERSECUTED JEWS BROUGHT FROM SPAIN TO TURKEY

A people whose Sultan, Sultan Suleyman, would send his fleet to bring persecuted Jews from Spain to Turkey, giving them land and money, are not likely to act in a tolerant manner.

TURKS HAVE CAPACITY TO RULE OVER ALIEN RACES

It is asserted that the Turks have no capacity to rule over alien races. When equality has been extended to all, this assertion has no force. To quote from Christian writers :

'The difference between the lot of rayas under their Turkish masters and that of the serfs of Christendom under their fellow-Christians and fellow-

country-men who were their lords was practically shown by the anxiety which the inhabitants of the countries next the Turkish frontier showed to escape from their homes and live under the Turkish yoke which is *frequently* represented as having been always so tyrannical.' 'I have seen', says the historian, 'multitudes of Hungarian rustics set fire to their homes and fly with their wives and children, their cattle and instruments of labour, to the Turkish territories, where they knew that, besides the payment of a tenth, they would be subject to no imposts or vexations'. (Lennclavius *apud* Elzevir cited in the Thornton and other writers). Sandy tells us that the inhabitants of Morea sought eagerly to return to the Turkish from the Venetian rule. Dr. Clark's 'Travels' informs us 'how bitterly the natives of the Crimea regretted the change of masters when the Russians succeeded the Turks in the domination of that country. The current of emigration set steadily from the part of Greece which was under King Otho to that which was still under the Sultan.'

After the Balkan War the Macedonians sent their representatives to claim self-government from the powers of Europe under the Ottoman Empire.

HISTORY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

His Excellency Chedo Mjatovitch, former Serbian Minister to the Court of St. James and the Sublime Porte (*Asiatic Quarterly*, October, 1913) has frankly acknowledged the motives which actuated the Christians of the Balkans to malign the Turks :

'Political interest made us (the Balkan nation) paint the Turks as cruel Asiatic tyrants, incapable of Europeans civilisation. An impartial history would prove that the Turks are rather Europeans than Asiatics, and that they are not cruel tyrants, but a nation loving justice and fairness and possessing qualities and virtues which deserve to be acknowledged and respected.'

COMPARISON BETWEEN OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND OTHER EUROPEAN EMPIRES

It is untrue to say that the Turks have not yet devéloped any country. Railways, telegraphs, and other instruments of 'civilisation' are to be found in the Ottoman Empire as elsewhere. It is far in advance of all countries in Eastern Europe. Bulgaria was the most prosperous, when it was separated from Turkey, and Cavala was the bone of contention on account of its tobacco industries. If the happiness of the people is the measure of good government and the equality of all the measure of self-respect, the Ottoman Empire remains unexcelled by any country in the world. It is common knowledge that governments by Christian races in all climes have resulted in poverty and degradation, ignorance, and increase of taxation, famine, plague, and pestilence. The 'burden of civilisation' does not exist and is self-assumed.

PROTECTION FOR THE MUSLIMS IN THE BALKANS

Protection of the Christians is another plea. No protection is needed. If

the Turks have no right to rule over a handful of Christians, what right can be claimed by Great Britain to rule over more than one hundred million Muslims ?

What about the Muslims in Bulgaria and Macedonia, Greece, Crete, Serbia, and Bosnia ? Has there ever been any attempt on the part of Great Britain and other champions of 'justice' to speak on behalf of these poor persons ? They have been massacred in the dead of night, their property destroyed, and civil rights denied to them, but not a word of protest.

EUROPE ALWAYS UNFAIR TO TURKEY : TREATIES NEVER KEPT

Europe has never been fair to the Turks. Treaties have been interpreted, only against them and never in their favour, e.g.,

1. The Treaty of Paris, Art. 7, March 30, 1856.
2. Convention annexed thereto confirmed by the insertion of the provisions therein in the 18th Protocol of the Treaty of Berlin.
3. Treaty of April, 1856.
4. Treaty of London, Art 2 and 7, March 13, 1871.
5. The Treaty of Berlin, Art. 2, July 13, 1878.
6. Convention of Defensive alliance between England and Turkey, July 4, 1878.
7. Convention between England and Turkey, July 1, 1878.

All these guaranteed the integrity of the Ottman Empire, but has there been any instance in which the signatories have kept their obligations ? Turkey always lost, and the Christians always won. What difference in sacredness exists between a treaty in favour of Belgium and a treaty in favour of Turkey ?

On what principle of justice is Turkey proposed to be made the scapegoat ?

TURKS FOUGHT LIKE BELGIUM IN SELF-DEFENCE

If Turkey fought in self-defence, or was forced to fight like Belgium, all the more reason to treat her with consideration and justice.

TURKS FRIENDLY TO ENGLAND AND FRANCE

We know for a fact that the Turks of all parties prior to the Balkan War were friendly to England and to France, and relied upon the traditional good-will of both these countries. But they were grievously disappointed when Mr. Asquith, the then Premier of England, having first stated that in any case the *status quo* would not be disturbed, but, finding that the Turks were not victorious as he expected, reversed his statement and said 'that the Allies were not to be deprived of the fruits of their victory' (*i.e.*, during the Balkan War).

TURKS ENTITLED TO A STATUS QUO ANTE BELLUM

The Turks are not only entitled to the preservation of that *status quo*

ante bellum, but also to the revision of the treaty after the Balkan War.

VARIOUS PARTS OF TURKEY

Syria is called by the Muslims as the Holy Shaam, and from the earliest days of Islam it formed an important religious association sacred to all Muslims. Palestine (five-sixths of its propulation being Muslim) is regarded as a sacred place next to Mecca. Mesopotamia is full of religious associations and traditions. Kurdistan, miscalled Armenia, of which an infinitesimal number is Armenian, a population abhorred by most of those who come into contact with them, and who have acted with great cruelty towards the Muslims, Kurds, and Turks, in a Muslim country the bulk of the population of which is Muslim. Asia Minor is chiefly peopled by the Turks and therefore a Turkish country. Thrace has 70 per cent of its population Turkish and so have the Straits.

Constantinople or Istamboul is the seat of the Khilaphat, and has been so for many centuries. Arabia contains the Holy Places of Islam, which must remain under the control of the Khalif.

ALL MUSLIMS AGREED THAT THE KHILAFAT MUST REMAIN IN THE HOUSE OF USMAN

Irrespective of treaty obligations which ought to be sacred to England and to France, Islam demands that these places should not be separated from the Khilafat, which must remain in the House of Osman, as by the laws of Islam the Shareef of Mecca is debarred from ever attaining that position. All Muslims, the hundred million British subjects, Arabs and non-Arabs, French subjects, are all agreed upon this point.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE AHD PRESS

Mr. Lloyd George, in his speech delivered in Jaunary, 1918, gave a pledge to the British Muslims and other subjects and to the Muslim world assuring them that the Turks would be left in full sovereignty in Thrace and Asia Minor, with Constantinople as the capital. The question of the Straits was left as before, for according to all treaties during the last centuries and a half it has been open to the commerce and ships of all nations. The other parts of the Ottoman Empire were also to remain part and parcel of the Empire as before, as the statement was made with a reservation, 'In our judgment', which may or may not be correct, having regard to circumstances.

WILSON TO THE MUSLIMS

President Wilson subsequently included this in his famous Fourteen Points on behalf of all *Entente* Powers.

TURKISH PEACE DELEGATION BASED ON FACTS AND FIGURES

The Turkish Peace Delegation, while claiming the maintenance of the

integrity of the Ottoman Empire on the basis of the *status quo ante bellum* and recognition of frontier in Thrace, where the Muslim population was in an overwhelming majority, pointed out that their claim was in conformity with the principles laid down by President Wilson on behalf of all Great Powers. They presented authentic statistics based upon Turkish, French, and Christian patriarchate sources which conclusively showed the overwhelming majority of the Muslims in the various parts of the Ottoman Empire, and said that the Ottoman Governmet was able to prove that 'it had never hindered the culture and development of the Christian populations'.

ATTEMPT TO BACK OUT OF PLEDGE

An attempt is being made in certain quarters to say that there was no pledge to the British Muslims and other subjects by Mr. Lloyd George as shown in paragraph 23, but that it was only an offer-provisional – to Turkey. This argument must fail, inasmuch as it was expressly stated in that very speech that it was intended for the reassurance of the British peoples, and, further, that it was assiduously circulated among British Muslims at the time. It was stated to have been based upon the consideration that the population in those parts was 'predominantly Moslem'. This was clearly a pledge to the British peoples.

ABSURDITY THEREOF

This pronouncement by Mr. Lloyd George cannot be separated from the Fourteen Ponits of President Wilson, and if they form basis of treaty with other nations it cannot be argued that in the case of Turkey they were only 'provisional' offer. On 4 October 1918, Prince Max of Baden proposed peace negotiations on the Basis of the Fourteen Points. On 13 October Germany accepted the Fourteen Points and on 11 November signed the Armistice. It was not till 30 October that Turkey signed the Armistice on the same basis. If the pledges aforesaid remained in force till 11 November it is difficult to see how they ceased to have any force on the 30th of the previous month.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE IN HIS SPEECH, 18 DECEMBER 1918 REFERRED TO TURKEY

On 18 December 1918, in the speech of Mr. Lloyd George, reference was made to Constantinople and the Straits. He spoke of 'the gates being slammed in our face' and 'of shortening of the war by two or three years if our fleet and merchant ships had been free to go through and assist Romania and Russia', and that they were 'treacherously shut in our face.' Based upon these considerations he said that the same porter cannot be trusted by us.

FALLACY OF THE STATEMENT

This argument is misleading and based upon considerations which cannot stand the test of justice and sense of honour which Mr. Bonar Law said

always sways British minds.

The Turks were under no duty to keep the Straits open at the time that the war was declared against them. Nor it is correct to say that they were closed treacherously, nor that the war would have been finished three years before if Romania could have been helped, as she entered the war on 27 August 1916, only.

TREATY OF THE DARDANELLES

By the Treaty of the Dardanelles of 5 January 1809, concluded between Great Britain and the Porte, no ships of war are to enter the Channel of Constantinople via the Straits of the Dardanelles and of the Black Sea, and that Great Britain promises 'on its part to conform to this principle' of 'ancient regulation of the Ottoman Empire'. An exception was made in favour of Russia by the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi in 1883, but was regarded as an exception only and not to derogate in any degree from the ancient rules of the Ottoman Empire which the Four Powers engaged to respect. In 1841, July 13, France and England and other Powers signed the Treaty and thereby engaged to respect the ancient rule, the Sultan engaging to uphold the rule. This Treaty was superseded by Article 10 of the Treaty of Paris, 1856, and the annexed convention which is to have the same validity as if it formed part of the principal Treaty. This Convention has been confirmed by Article 2 of the Treaty of London of 1871, which allowed the Sultan to open the Straits in case of necessity. At the time the Treaty of Berlin was being concluded, Lord Salisbury recognised the independent determination of His Majesty the Sultan in this matter in conformity with the spirit of the existing treaties.

Thus it is self-evident that the Turks on whom the war was forced on 1 November 1914, were under no duty to keep the Straits open for the fleet, etc., of hostile Powers, nor could they be accused of treacherously closing the door. If anything, even in time of peace, they were bound by treaty obligations to keep them closed against all ships of war in accordance with the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire.

MR. CHURCHILL'S STATEMENT

We fail to understand the present attitude of the Premier. Mr. Churchill has invoked the protection of what he calls the British method of non-evacuating a territory. We cannot believe this, as otherwise it will be the greatest blot on the name of England to occupy a place under solemn arrangements and then to raise all sorts of obstacles in order to avoid evacuation.

CONSEQUENCES OF ACTING WITH JUSTICE TOWARDS THE KHILAFAT

Great Britain, France, America, and Italy are under a duty to treat the Khilafat with justice and respect, as any interference with the Khilafat in defiance of assurances to Muslims would be declaring war upon Islam, with

the necessary consequence that every Muslim would by the operation of law become opposed to every Christian, a state of things bound to result in consequences the end of which cannot be foreseen.

THE STRAITS AND CONSTANTINOPLE

The internationalisation of the Straits will be an unjust and useless device, as they are open to merchant ships of all nations.

The internationalisation of the Constantinople, the seat of the Khilafat, would be contrary to all principles of justice, a breach of the pledge and an insult to the religious feelings of all Muslims, with consequences most disastrous to the progress of humanity and cooperation between the Muslims and the Christians.

ASSISTANCE AND SYMPATHY DESIRED

What is desired is not the control of this place or that, but the observance of treaty obligations and sympathetic support in the development of economic resources. The Turks have never acted but honourably, have always respected treaty obligations, and have ever been friendly to England and France.

CONCLUSIONS

On review of all facts the conclusions we arrive at are as follows :

(1) The integrity of the Ottoman Empire, with Constantinople as its capital, and control of the Straits as guaranted by the various treaties, should be preserved as before.

(2) Protection should be given to the Muslims of Greece and other Balkan States where their lives, property, and honour are at the mercy of bigoted Christians, and compensation given to those Muslims who have suffered in the Balkan War.

(3) A basis of co-operation with the Muslims and Christians of the world cannot be established unless the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafat is once more guaranteed....

We earnestly hope that the Peace Conference will give its decisions in respect of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafat in accordance with the principles of justice, treaties, and pledges given to the Muslims of India and other countries.

Otherwise we fear that in place of settling questions for the peace of the world it will inaugurate an era which will create bitter animosity resulting in the effusion of blood between Muslims and Christians all over the world and for all time.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

45

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST

10 January 1920

The British Red Crescent Society has received from an eyewitness a harrowing account of the distress and suffering among the Muslim inhabitants of the district of Smyrna (Aidin), in Asia Minor, and of the appalling mortality, especially among children, resulting from starvation and scarcity of clothing. Villages and farms have been wiped out; hōuses have been deliberately burnt down, and no less than 1,00,000 people are homeless and in the depths of misery. The Rev. Mr. Frew, who administered the British Red Crescent charity in Thrace, Macedonia, and Constantinople in the Balkan War, writes as follows :

'The need is very great and very urgent. I have it from a reliable source that some hundreds have been dying every week from privation. Almost nothing at all adequate to the needs of the situation has been attempted. The help they must have is yet to be given. I am also willing to go down to Aidin and seek out where need is most urgent, and go from place to place and see personally to helping these poor sufferers in the same way as I did in Thrace and Macedonia during the Balkan War. The need is now. They have suffered terribly. I hope that help will be sent to them at once.'

In view of the acute need of help, the British Red Crescent Society has remitted at once to Mr. Frew through the Foreign Office £800 for the relief of these afflicted people. But this sum will hardly mitigate a fraction of the distress and suffering. We therefore venture to appeal through your columns to the charity of all benevolent people for help. Contributions may be sent direct to the Society's bankers, Messrs. Coutts and Co., 440, Strand, W. C.—Yours etc.

Source : Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

46

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR, THE TIMES

22 January 1920

The letter which appears in this morning's issue of the '*Times*' over the signatures of several eminent men calls for instant protest. Its calls assump-

tion that the suggestion they put forward will meet with ready acceptance among the Muslims is not wanting in honour. But it lacks insight into living and potent factors which have come into existence from the proclaimed desire to deprive the Ottoman State of its capital and European province. In their recapitulation of history your correspondents have forgotten that the Ottoman State, in the zenith of its power, did good service to Western Europe. In the 16th and 17th centuries Turkey time after time came to the help of France when near being overwhelmed by the Hapsburgs. In 1857 Turkey opened Egypt to the passages of British troops to crush the great Indian Mutiny. In the conflict of the East India Company with Tippoo Sultan Turkey stifled his efforts to make it a religious war. This the French remember. One is often apt to lose sight of past facts, but surely the services rendered by Muslim soldiers during the recent war on the faith or a pledge, which no amount of juggling with words can alter, should not be allowed to slip from memory. The record of nation is pure; but in light of recent happenings it might be more fitting to lay less stress on Turkish 'misdeeds'.

As your correspondents are anxious to find a home for the yet unborn League of Nations, I venture to suggest Jerusalam as associated with 'the peace and goodwill' which the Founder of Christianity brought to the world. It would give the architects even finer scope for the exercise of their talent, and as a listening post it would not be too distant from the rumblings of the Balkans.

Apart from all this, may I ask, do your correspondents realise what problem they are creating for the British Empire and humanity at large by the policy they advocate ? Religious and academic zeal appear to combine to rouse from the Atlantic to China a hatred and a bitterness the consequences of which no statesman, I am sure, can contemplate with equanimity.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

47

TELEGRAM SENT BY HAKIM AJMAL KHAN, PRESIDENT OF THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

On behalf of Indian Mussulmans, I request that H. H. the Aga Khan, Right Honourable Mr. Ameer Ali and Mr. Kidwai be sent with the British Ministers to present Muslim point of view at the Peace Conference and that they should act not only as advisers to Ministers, but have powers to speak in the Conference'

Source : The Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

48

KHILAFAT DEPUTATION TO VICEROY

19 January 1920

In India the Khilafat agitation suddenly leaped into the forefront by the release of the famous Ali Brothers from unexplained internment for the last four years late in December 1919. For the next few months politics in India was the politics of Messrs Mahommad Ali and Shaukat Ali, and the Khilafat question in their hands began gradually to replace the Punjab agitation. In the all India Khilafat Conference held at Amritsar a resolution had been passed to send a deputation of Mussulmans and Hindus representing the Khilafat Conference. The deputation waited upon the Viceroy on January 19, 1920 and presented the following address which was read by Mr. M. A. Ansari of Delhi. The signatories were H. M. Hakim Ajmal Khan, S. M. Shaukat Ali Khan, Mr. Mahommad Ali Khan, Mr. S. Hussain, Mian Mahommad Chhotani, Maulana Abdul Bari, Abdul Hassan, K. B. Maulana Wilazed Hassain, Maulana Abdul Majid of Burdwan, Maulana Abul K. Azad of Calcutta, Syea Suleman Nadwi, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Syed Zahur Ahmed, Secretary, All India Muslim League; Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew, Mr. Mumtaz Hussain, Barrister, Lucknow; Maulvi Mahommad Ali Qadiani, Maulvi Sana Ullah Saheb of Amritsar, Mr. Ghulam Mohiuddin of Qasuar, Mahommad Zaffar of Sialkot, Maulana Mahommad F. of Allahabad, Hakim Mahommad Mussa Khan Sherwani of Aligarh, Maulana K. Saheb of Delhi, Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy of Bombay, Pandit Rambhojdutta Choudhry, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, Swami Shraddhanand, the Hon. Pandit M. M. Malviya, the Hon. Pandit Motilal Nehru, Syed Hasan Imam, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Raja of Mahmudabad, Aga Hassan Saheb, Raja of Jahangirabad, the Hon. Mr. Fazlul Huq of Calcutta, the Hon. Syed Raza Ali of Allahabad, and others.

'May it please your Excellency – We, the members of the Khilafat deputation, authorised in this behalf by the Khilafat Conference at the very important session recently held at Amritsar, beg to approach your Excellency with a view to enlist the sympathy and secure the fullest assistance of your Excellency's Government in a matter of vital importance in which we are confident neither the one nor the other will be withheld. The Khilafat Conference has more than once resolved that a deputation should proceed at an early date to England and lay before His Majesty the King Emperor and his Ministers a full and clear statement of the obligations imposed on every Muslim by his faith and of the united wishes cherished by Indian Mussulmans regarding the Khilafat and cognate questions, such as those relating to Muslim control over every portion of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, Khalifa's wardenship of the Holy Places, and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Such a desire would have been

both natural and laudable at any time but in view of the grave situation that exists today and is fast developing into an unmistakable menace, it has acquired an urgency and an insistence that have compelled us to give respectful expression to it with your Excellency's permission through the agency of such a representative deputation as ours. After a protracted war in which almost the entire civilised world was engaged on one side or the other, in which each nation vied with its neighbours in pouring out its blood and treasures on the most lavish scale in order to secure victory, and of which the revages and horrors have been without precedent, it was natural that even those indirectly yet powerfully affected thereby should experience extreme war-weariness at its close and feel intense abhorrence on the ancient method of settling the vital affairs of mankind through the arbitrament of the sword. Nor was it less natural that the world should cry with one voice for a lasting peace to be concluded with the utmost rapidity, and yet, although more than a year has elapsed since the conclusion of the armistice and more than six months have passed since the treaty of Peace was signed by Germany, peace seems almost as far as ever from resuming its sway over mankind and our own continent of Asia is not without reason apprehensive of grave developments of which no one can pretend to foresee the final end. The world seems once more to be approaching a grave crisis and although it is not possible to speak with any degree of certainty of the regions and the races likely to be affected by the storm that is obviously brewing, it requires no great perspicacity to foretell that when it comes to burst the Muslim world will not be left unaffected. We may suggest without disrespect that it is of paramount importance at such a juncture that the authorities at the centre of this composite Empire should be fully alive to all that transpires in the remotest corners of His Majesty's world-wide Dominions, and the least that we may reasonably expect from the statesmen of the Empire is that in concluding any settlement to which they attach any degree of finality, they should take into the fullest consideration the most binding religious obligations and the most highly cherished sentiments of 70 millions of Indian Mussulmans and the no less ardent sympathies of 2:0 millions of their compatriots. For one reason or another sufficiently forcible expression had not been given to these sentiments and sympathies during the war, and we regret more than we can tell that even religio. obligations to which we have referred were not set forth with that degree of clearness and emphasis that is essential for the purpose of communicating the religious doctrines of one set of people to the ruling classes of another of alien faith.

DANGERS AND BLUNDERS AHEAD

'This is neither the time nor the place to enter into any lengthy discussion of the reasons that swayed the Mussulmans of India, nor into any such exposition of the doctrines that they hold to be into any such exposition of the doctrines that they hold to be absoultely essential for their salvation. It

suffices to say that since the armistice was concluded more than a year ago they have not spared themselves in the task of a clear exposition of these essential doctrine of their faith, and they are not unmindful of the fact which is becoming clearer every day that your Excellency's Government, various Local Governments, and those Englishmen who had held responsible offices in India before their retirement, have gradually come to realise and appreciate in a daily increasing measure the deep concern of the Mussulmans of India and of their compatriots in the settlement to be concluded with the Ottoman Khilafat. Realizing at the same time their own responsibility for the peace and good governance of India and tranquility on her borders, Your Excellency's Government and the Right Hon. the Secretary of State have, we may thankfully acknowledge, made representations to His Majesty's Government but that Government is obviously so far removed from us both in point of distance and political and religious surroundings, that neither our own voice nor the representations of this Government have apparently affected the opinions, view-point, and preconceived ideas of His Majesty's Ministers to an appreciable degree, and a number of ministerial utterances can be cited to prove, if proof was necessary that they are inclined to insist on a settlement of such world-wide interest and importance as if it was solely, or at any rate mainly, the concern of the small section of His majesty's subjects who are British by birth and Christian by faith. From the rest they seem to expect impassive acquiescence, if not willing submission to the dictates of their narrowly conceived and far from imperial statesmanship. Need we say that such an estimate of the situation that a sectional and sectarian settlement will create will prove disastrously incorrect. Deeply apprehensive as we are of the calamitous consequences of such an estimate and still more deeply anxious to prevent them while we can, we have been driven to the conclusion that one final effort must be made to give timely warning to the imperial authorities of the dangers we so clearly foresee, and respectfully entreat them to avoid the evil consequences of a settlement sought to be forced on the Mussulmans of the world contrary to the clearest commandments of their creed and united wishes of so large a portion of humanity. Recent experience as well as the inherent difficulties of discussing such grave matters over the wires at the distance of seven thousand miles of land and sea have forced us to resolve that with your Excellency's assistance a deputation of ours should proceed at the earliest possible opportunity to England and place directly our humble but frank submissions before His Majesty and his Ministers. And since we have been repeatedly asked to remember that in arranging such a settlement Great Britain, whatever her position among her Allies and associates, could not have their interest and wishes out of consideration, we trust that our deputation will be enabled to explain to the Allied and associated Nations and their governments the nature and binding force of Islamic obligations and the true character and scope of Muslim aspirations. We need not repeat here the clear conditions of future peace as set forth by the President of the United

States of America on the basis of which the Khilafat concluded the armistice, nor the unmistakable pledges of the British Premier regarding Constantinople, Thrace and the homelands of the Turks. We respectfully submit that no prospective territorial or political gains, whether real or only imagined, can compensate Great Britain or her Allies and associates for the loss of moral credit if their pledged word is left unredeemed, and the ingenious interpretations suggested now as an afterthought by irresponsible persons will in no way prove helpful to the responsible authorities. The shock of this blow to the moral prestige of the Empire will be felt all the more severely in consequence of the sad disillusionment with regard to the pledges of His Majesty's Government proclaimed by your Excellency's predecessor at the commencement of the war with Turkey.

BREACH OF PLEDGES

'But it is not because the Mussulmans of India take their stand on British and Allied pledges, any more than they expect that a settlement with such extended and intricate ramifications can be governed by their own interests and sentiments alone, that they are so deeply agitated to-day when they apprehend a breach of these solemn pledges and an almost complete disregard of these universally cherished sentiments. The Muslims of India will entirely fail in their purpose if they cannot make it clear to those who have made themselves responsible for preserving to them their religious freedom in its entirety that their deepest concern to-day is that a settlement of the Khilafat and cognate questions is apparently being outlined by his Majesty's Government and their Allies which no Mussulman can accept or acquiesce in without jeopardising eternal salvation. This is the one governing consideration on which attention must be focussed and so intense is it that even if the Ottoman Turks could be made to acquiesce in such a settlement it would remain as unacceptable as ever to every believing Mussulman. The preservation of the Khilafat as a temporal no less than a spiritual institution is not so much a part of their faith as the very essences thereof, and no analogies from other creeds that tolerate the lacerating and devitalizing distinction between things spiritual and things temporal, between the Church and the State, can serve any purpose save that of clouding and befogging the clearest of issues. Temporal power is the very essence of the institution of the Khilafat, and Mussulmans can never agree to any change in its character or to the dismemberment of its Empire. The no less important question of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, over no portion of which can any kind of non-Muslim control be tolerated, is equally clearly not one of Muslim sentiment but of Islamic faith. Similarly Islam also declares and defines the sanctity of the holy places of Islam and places this and similar matters beyond the uninformed interpretation of people of alien faiths. Mussulmans insist and with perfect reason that the Khalifa alone shall be the warden of the holy Places. As regards the integrity of the Khalifa's dominions we are painfully aware that some sections of the Muslims

of Arabia have in clear defiance of the laws of Islam stood out of from the solid mass of the rest of the Muslim world. But instead of this being any argument against the latter it furnishes it with one more compelling reason for praclaiming the truth and in accordance with the divine declaration that all Mussulmans are brothers, to one another, and the divine injunction to make peace between brother Indian Mussulmans must seek to remove existing misunderstanding and eliminate every cause of friction that may tend to separate Arab from Ajam, and Turk from Tajik. And it is the logical consequences of Islamic brotherhood that all Mussulmans should share the sorrows and sufferings of their brothers in every corner of the world and should see to it that principles of such universal application as that of self-determination, should be applied to the Muslim no less than to the Christian and to the Asiatic no less than to the European. It is true that a great part of Europe and Christendom charges the Ottoman Turks with religious injustice and political inaptitude, but it is permissible to argue that those who do so are neither free from old-standing prejudices nor from a bitterness of later growth, and we are confident that the verdict of history would be pronounced in due course with full regard for the difficult position in which the Ottoman Turks have stood for centuries and that it would vindicate alike the basic toleration of Islam and the essential humanity of the Turks. The loyalty of Indian Mussulmans no less than that of other communities of India to their Sovereign has been an abiding asset acknowledged as well as proclaimed throughout the history of British rule in India. It is also admitted that it depends and is mainly based on the preservation of their religious freedom in its entirety. It has not been necessary to remind Government of this aspect of Muslim loyalty, and in fact of the loyalty of every Indian community, it is because we thankfully acknowledge that until lately no question had arisen in which it appeared likely to be forgotten or ignored now that the policy of the Allied and associated Powers and the dictates of Islam seem to run counter to each other. We respectfully submit that justice and expediency alike demand that what is unalterable by human hand and has never been so altered throughout the thirteen centuries of Islam shall remain unaltered, and what is susceptible to change and is essentially changeable with every change in circumstances and surroundings should, when necessary, changes. Even the most cherished Muslim sentiment may be sacrificed in subservience to imperial demands, though we humbly submit that true imperialism should give proportionate consideration to the wishes and sentiments of the Empire, but the requirements of Islamic law are so definite and of such a binding nature that they cannot be reduced by a hair's breadth to suit the desires of Allied and associated Powers any more than they can be enlarged to further the mundane ambitions of Mussulmans themselves. These are the limits set by Allah and none shall transgress them, but while the Mussulmans take their stand firmly on their creedal obligations, they respectfully submit that true imperial interests point to the same path as Islamic commandments.

'The war may be over but peace is still distant and doubtful, and we shall beseech the Imperial authorities not to under-rate that worth and value of Islamic friendship and loyalty. A settlement unacceptable alike to Muslims and Indians, now happily reunited and standing shoulder to shoulder, will bring no peace because it will bring no sense of justice and no contentment. No Mussulman who hopes and prays for salvation would thence-forward know any rest and he could only aspire to salvation by following the dictates of Islam, however the consequences may be. But if on the contrary the heart of India is won by a generous recognition of her fitness for managing her own affairs as a member of the British Commonwealth, and the Muslim world is reconciled by a just appreciation of Islamic responsibilities and obligations, Muslim sentiments of half the world would be at the back of great Britain and no power in the world could dare to deny to her the right that are hers and her Empire's. The menace that now looms so large would then shrink into nothingness without a blow being struck in wrath or a drop of human blood being shed in vain warfare. The world would then be truly safe not only for democracy but for God and the truth, and it is in this spirit that we desire to send our mission with Your Excellency's assistance to Great Britain and the Allied and Associated countries. We also feel confident that once the success of our mission is assured it would set itself equal zeal to reassure the Muslim world and reconcile those who have parted, may be in anger, may be in sorrow, but in any case through misunderstanding of their common interests which everyone anxious to promote the peace of the world should endeavour to remove. May it be given through the grace of Merciful Providence to us and to your Excellency's Government to accomplish this humane and sacred purpose.'

THE VICEROY'S REPLY

In reply the Viceroy made a long speech, in the course of which he said that the deputation had given him an opportunity of expressing the views of his Government regarding the Khilafat. He first assured them that no efforts had been spared, no stone left unturned, to place before the Allied Council the plea of the Indian Muslims on the Turkish peace treaty, by the representatives of India to the Peace Council, viz., the Maharaja Bikaner, Lord Sinha and Mr. Montague. As regards the confidential communications between him and the Secretary of State, he said :

'From the nature of the case I cannot disclose in any detail the communications which have passed between us, and the representations which have been made by us, but I will endeavour to take you into my confidence and explain, so far as I am able, what action has been taken by the Secretary of State and my own Government to place your case before the Peace Conference. Shortly after the Armistice, I represented to the Secretary of State that feeling in India was much disturbed over the question of the Turkish peace terms and particularly with regard to the Holy Places in the Hedjaz and the future of

Constantinople, and steps were taken to ensure that the views of Muslim India should be fully placed before the Conference by the representatives of India. The Indian Delegation, as you know, was composed of the Secretary of State, the Maharaja of Bikaner and Lord Sinha, and I can assure you that they pressed the case for the favourable treatment of Turkey with an earnestness of purpose and force of argument which could not be surpassed. They had before them the memorial dated the Ist Jan. 1919 which was signed by prominent Mahommedan residents in Europe including among other His Highness the Aga Khan, the Hon. Mr. Ameer Ali, Sir Abbas Ali Baig, and Mr. Yusuf Ali, and they made full use of all arguments which were adduced by these distinguished gentlemen for the lenient treatment of Turkey and the consideration of the sentiments of Indian Muslims. I venture to think, gentlemen, that there is no relevant argument on behalf of Turkey which was not fully utilised by the Indian Delegation. The Delegation received a hearing from the Peace Conference in the middle of May, and as a result of the previous representations of my Government and the efforts of the Secretary of State, it was accompanied on the occasion by three prominent Indian Muslims—His Highness the Aga Khan, Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan and Mr. Yusuf Ali. In the same month my Government again cabled to the Secretary of State urging upon him the importance in any settlement of the Turkish peace terms and of considering the effect of these upon Mahommedan opinion in India. I may add that ever since the Armistice, I have been unceasingly in private communication with the Secretary of State and have never failed to urge upon him, though this was hardly necessary as his views coincide so closely with my own, that Muslim feeling in India must be taken into the most serious account in coming to a final decision. I would remind you, however, that this is not a matter in which we are dealing only with the British Cabinet. The war was not a war between Turkey and British only, but other great powers were also involved. The decision of Turkey to throw in her lot with the Central Powers undoubtedly prolonged the war and increased the grievous miseries caused thereby. Judgement is now being pronounced at Paris by a tribunal of all the Allied Power and not by Great Britain alone. The future of Turkey is not being decided by His Majesty's Government but by the representatives of all the Powers.'

Coming to the subject of the deputation, His Excellency said :

'I cannot admit the validity of all your contentions, but no advantage would be gained were I to examine your memorial paragraph by paragraph in an argumentative spirit. What I do fully recognise is that the Mahommedans of India feel very deeply on this subject, and that the occasion is not one for unprofitable controversy, particularly on religious points, but for helpful co-operation. You desire to send a deputation to Europe to lay your view before the British Cabinet and if possible before the Paris Conference. I will do all I can to assist you in your mission, and to enable you to represent but, as I have said before, the decision may come upon at any moment. The views

of Muslim India at Paris, and recognising the need for speedy action I have already cabled the gist of your address to the Secretary of State so that he may be in possession of it without delay in the hope that this may strengthen his hands in dealing with the question.'

And then after expressing the hope that Moslem loyalty would remain as firm as ever, the Viceroy said :

'On the matter of the Khilafat, His Majesty's Government and my own Government have repeatedly made the declaration which I now reaffirm that the question of the Khilafat is one for the Mahommedans and Mahommedans only to decide. The contention, however, which you urge in your address that Turkey should preserve in full integrity the sovereignty and dominion which she possessed before the war is one which I fear we cannot reasonably hope will be recognised by the Allied Powers in Conference. Before Turkey made her fatal mistake, His Majesty's Government had guaranteed that such integrity would be the reward of neutrality but now that she has submitted her fate to the arbitrament of the sword she cannot expect any more that any other Power which drew the sword in the cause of Germany wholly to escape the consequences of her action. I fully realise that these must be a matter of grief and regret to the Muslims of India. I would however ask them to take a practical view and a long view of the situation. Let them remember that when this unhappy war broke out it was the devout wish of every Briton to maintain the old ties of friendship which bound together the British Empire and the Turkish Empire. We could so well have trodden together the same path and have emerged victorious from the struggle side by side. Unhappily those in whose hands the destinies of Turkey rested as that supreme moment chose to join our enemies. That action and its consequences have created the difficult problems which now confront us, but as you rightly indicate in your address, there is a community of interests and a long tradition of friendship between the British and Turkish Empires. I look forward therefore to a time when our old relations with the Turkish Empire will be re-established and quickened on a basis of mutual advantage and mutual goodwill.'

'Do not let your minds be too much overclouded by the passing shadows of to-day when the whole world is in a state of flux and everyone of us of whatever class, nation, or creed, feels buffeted and torn by the events it has been our lot to pass through. Take a long view. What is good-will and must survive. Meanwhile from the deadly struggle in which the world has been engaged, the British Empire has emerged stronger than ever. Within that Empire the religion and lives and property of Muslims have been secured. Within it and beyond it there will still be an assured future for Islam and peace and prosperity as in the past for all Muslims.'

REPLY TO THE VICEROY'S STATEMENT BY THE KHILAFAT DEPUTATION

20 January 1920

The Viceroy's reply, whilst it was perfectly courteous, was equally disappointing in that His Excellency said in emphatic language that Turkey when she had her choice deliberately drew the sword against the Allied Powers and must take the consequence. We consider this means punishment to Turkey for having joined the Central Powers contrary to the solemn declarations made by Mr. Asquith, the then Prime Minister, after Turkey had so made by her choice. His Excellency hoped that whatever be the decision of Indian Muslims loyalty would remain as staunch as ever. We desire to place on record our firm conviction that should the peace terms result unfavourably to Muslim religion and sentiments, they would place an undue strain upon Muslim loyalty, and knowing as we do the universal feeling in India, as men with a full sense of responsibility, it is not possible for us to give the assurance His Excellency has expected. It is due to the Peace Conference that is now sitting, to ourselves, and to the Empire to which we desire to remain loyal, to state in explicit language the minimum that will satisfy Muslim sentiments.

THE MINIMUM DEMAND

'Arabia, as delimited by Moslem authorities, and the Holy Places of Islam must remain under the control of the Khalifa, full guarantees being taken consistently with the dignity of a Sovereign State for genuine Arab Self-Government should the Arabs desire it. We advisedly use the word 'genuine'—because the present arrangement is thoroughly distrusted by the overwhelming majority of intelligent Muslim opinion.

'Islam has ever associated temporal power with the Khilafat. We therefore consider that to make of the Sultan a mere puppet would add insult to injury and would only be understood by Indian Muslims as an effort given to them by a combination of Christian powers. Whilst therefore we must insist upon the pledge given by Mr. Lloyd George on the 5 January 1918, being fulfilled, in order to show that we desire no more than the strictest justice, we concede the right of the Allied Powers to ask for such guarantees as may be considered necessary for full protection of Non-Muslim races living under the Sultan. We hope even at this eleventh hour that British Ministers will give due weight to and appreciate Muslim sentiment in India, supported as it is by practically the whole of enlightened Hindu opinion.

'His Excellency has stated that it is just possible that the peace terms may be completed and declared within a few days and we can only hope that it is not yet too late to mend what mistakes may have been committed. We claim that the British Government is as much a trustee for Muslim and Indian interests as for Christian. It is therefore not enough that our sentiment and

wishes are placed before the League but it is essential that British Ministers should make our case their own.'

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

49

LETTER FROM MR. G. M. BHURGRI TO MR. LLOYD GEORGE, PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

15 January 1920

In September last the London Delegation of the All India Muslim League submitted to you a representation signed by Messrs. Jinnah, Hasan Imam, Yakub Hasan and myself on the question of the Settlement of Peace with Turkey.

Since then the anxiety of the Indian Muslims has been increasing, and now that they have reason to believe that it is the British Ministers, with the exception of the Right Honourable Mr. Montague, who are most hostile to Turkey, and most indifferent to the unanimous and oft-expressed views of 72 million Muslims of India, their anxiety is fast reaching the point of exasperation.

The British Empire consists of more Muslims than Christians, therefore Muslims are surprised to notice that the British Ministers are allowing their racial and religious prejudices against the Turks and Islam to make them oblivious to the interests of the British Empire itself.

If the views and sentiments of 72 million loyal citizens of India are violated by the British statesmen to please alien peoples and their Ministers and Governments, it will be too much to expect that their loyalty will remain unaffected.

The Muslims of India have already passed under very trying ordeals. In the general war it so happened that England and Turkey were against each other, and the Muslims of India were entrusted in both secularly in one, religiously in the other. To the Muslim people there is nothing dearer than their religion, and, therefore, it was only when they were assured that 'no question whatever of religion was involved in the war,' that all the Muslim sacred Places will be 'immune from attack and molestation', and that Great Britain and her Allies and associates 'had no territorial ambitions and greed' that they came forward to give the fullest possible support to Great Britain and her Allies.

Muslims fought on all the battle fronts—they fought even against their own brethren in Mesopotamia and Palestine, etc. Now they are made to

realise that they were deceived. The war, against the Turks was a crusade, and its result is threatened to be the banishment of the banner of Islam from Europe, the ejection of the Khilifat from Darulsalam, the seat of Islam (Constantinople), and a deliberate humiliation of Islam against Christianity. This state of affairs is naturally leading the Muslims of the world and specially the solid mass of 72 million Muslims of India, to desperation. They with their fellow countrymen, have already refused to join in the official peace celebrations. They have held Khilafat days in every village and hamlet of India. Khilafat Committees have been formed all over India, and, only a few weeks ago, and All India Conference was held at Delhi which has appointed two Committees to formulate practical schemes to boycott British goods and to stop co-operation with British Government if the threat of expelling the Crescent from Europe and of dismembering the Muslim Empire are carried out by Great Britain and her Allies.

The interest which the Muslims of India have been taking in the Turkish Empire is of long standing.

Since the extinction of the Muslim Empire in India that interest increased further, and the British Government itself acknowledged, and at times, even encouraged it.

The constitution of Islam demands an independent Khalifa, as the late Lord Cromer, who knew something of the Islamic constitution, made clear in a debate in the House of Lords on April 20, 1915. He said : 'I think we might go so far as to give them some sort of assurance that the Khalifa should be not only a Muslim but a Muslim of such position as to be independent of any European pressure of any kind or sort.'

And Lord Crewe, on behalf of the Government, on the same occasion, gave this pledge : 'It is not for us, I will not say to attempt to impose a Khalifa on the Muslim world, but even to bring about the forcible means a situation which would in practice compel the choice to fall on a particular individual.'

For the last four centuries Constantinople has been the seat of the Muslim Khalifa. Even English writers have called it Darulsalam—the seat of Islam.

On January 5, 1918, you yourself admitted the right of the Turks to Constantinople, Thrace and Asia Minor, and recognised them to be 'their homelands'.

It has repeatedly been admitted that Thrace and Asia Minor, as well as Constantinople, are 'predominantly Turkish'.

All the Allied and associated Powers promised the Muslim Sovereign of Turkey 'a secure sovereignty' over all the 'Turkish portions' of the Empire.

Now it is proposed against the pledged words of Great Britain and its associates, against the rule of self-determination, and in violation of the laws and constitution of Islam to dismember the Turkish Empire altogether, either under the cover of 'Mandates', or under the excuse of freeing Christians from

the Muslim rule, or even to satisfy the territorial ambitions of certain Powers.

If Christian peoples would refuse to live under the rule of Muslims, Muslims will also naturally try to be free from Christian rule, more so after what has happened in Egypt and India, thus medieval wars and quarrels of religions and races will ensue.

It was repeatedly announced that the war that has ended was meant to be the last war. If there are to be no wars in the future, then the settlement that is now proposed as regards the Ottoman Empire must be different.

The Muslim majority in Western and Eastern Thrace and Asia Minor should not be given under the oppressive rule of the Christian minority.

The interests of minorities have been safeguarded in other countries. In the same way they can be safeguarded in the Turkish Empire.

Indians themselves are demanding self-government in the same way those peoples who demand self-government under the sovereignty of the Muslim Khalifa may be given self-governing institutions.

In short, the settlement with Turkey should be based upon justice and right, not on prejudice, fanaticism or might.

If England had not departed from its old policy of friendship with Turkey and Islam, Turkey would not have joined the Central Powers, the Straits would not have been closed, the war would not have lasted so long. Great Britain should, therefore, revert to its policy of friendship for Turkey and Islam, and that will guarantee the future peace as well as the prosperity of the British Empire.

In the war against Turkey India has played the most prominent part, and the Muslims of India are most vitally interested. Therefore, I beg you, on behalf of the All-India Muslim League, and in the interest of the British Empire, to use your great influence to ensure such a peace with Turkey as would achieve the satisfaction of the Muslims of India, and that Mr. Montague and few Muslim representatives should also accompany other British Delegates to Peace Conference at Paris.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, January, 1920.

50

AMEER ALI ON THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY & ISLAM AND WHY THE TURKS SHOULD KEEP CONSTANTINOPLE

If I were asked to discuss the very grave question of the relation of Christianity to Islam at this moment I should say first of all, after the great upheaval we have witnessed—the result of which has been to weaken the

moral foundations on which society in every part of the world is based—that the two great faiths which owe their origin to a common stock and have common traditions, and whose ideals for the uplifting of humanity are identical, should join hands in that great work.

I am grieved, however, to see that the divergence between the two faiths instead of lessening is becoming greater. For nearly half a century I have laboured to bring Islam and Christianity more closely together. The present controversy about Turkey and the manifestations of the prejudices which still exist in this country concerning the Islamic nations are evidence that not only have my efforts been in vain, but that the spirit which centuries ago led Europe to hurt itself on Western Asia is still strong among a large mass of our fellow-subjects in the British Empire. Admittedly the attitude adopted towards Turkey and her retantion of Constantinople is based on religious sentiment. It was this sentiment which inspired the thanks-giving in service in Westminister Abbey and other churches over the fall of Jerusalem. It is this sentiment which animates the religious sentiment of the people of England when they advocate the carrying out of the 'bag and baggage' policy in regard to Turkey.

THE SULTAN'S INDEPENDENCE

It is well known that Islam is divided into two great sects—the Sunni and the Shiah. The majority are of the Sunni sect, whose spiritual head is the Sultan of Turkey. The House of Ottoman obtained the Khalifate in 1517, and the Ottoman Sultan's title to the spiritual headship is recognised by all who belong to the Sunni sect. This headship, I may say, carries with it a disquisition touching the spiritual nexus which links Khalifate and congregation. It is also not generally known that among the Sunni sect the validity of the prayers depends on the fulfilment by the spiritual head of certain conditions laid down by the law.

The Muslim contention is therefore that the Sultan of Turkey, whom they regard as the lawful Khilafa, should be left free from interference, independent in prestige and dignity, with Constantinople, the seat of the Khalifate, restored to him. The threat that the Turks are to be driven out of Europe and Constantinople taken from them has caused, and is still causing, the greatest bitterness.

The great legislation which has just been carried out under the auspices of Mr. Montague requires to make it a success absolute solidarity among the peoples of India. The Muslims have declared that if Turkey should be treated vindictively, if the pledge which Mr. Llyod George gave in the name of England, and which they consider England bound in honour to maintain, is not adhered to or fulfilled, they will refuse to co-operate with the Government in any way, and will stand sullenly aloof from all act or part

in the work of progress in India.

—*Daily Graphic*, January 19, 1920.

ST. SOPHIA

Today there is not a Christian in the Near East who is not looking and praying for its redemption. The Turk has no earthly right to it whatsoever. Whatever may be the ultimate fate of Constantinople itself, whether the Sultan is expelled into Asia Minor or is allowed to remain in Europe as a kind of international prisoner, St. Sophia ought surely to be restored to her own. The Friday proclamation must for ever cease.

—*Daily Express*, January 17, 1920.

THE FUTURE OF ST. SOPHIA

I am told that when the terms of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey come to be discussed the future of the church of St. Sophia will be discussed and an effort made to remove it from the possession of the Turks.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, January 14, 1920.

CONSTANTINOPLE AND ST. SOPHIA

May I venture to suggest that the whether Constantinople remains the Turkish capital or not the mosque of St. Sophia should become once more a Christian church ?

—*Daily Telegraph*, January 16, 1920.

CHRISTIANS AND ST. SOPHIA

When the problem of St. Sophia's fate was raised some months ago and the curious were wondering whether the great church should return to Orthodox keeping, or to Catholic, or to what other phase of Christian faith, we suggested that the edifice might perhaps be left in the hands of Muslims until they could no longer say : 'See how you Christians hate each other. See with what fury you exact vengeance upon your enemies whom your Master commanded you to love.' See how you persecute, imprison, and torture those who attempt to follow your Master's words : 'Would it not be as well to leave the recovery of your church until you have recovered your God ?' We are inclined now to make a similar suggestion on the political side. We want no more of that hushed propaganda Russian against British, British against German, German against French, French against Italian, Greek against Turk, and all against all. Let us wait till we see whether Christians can refrain from massacring each other for two years in succession. That would prove an immense advance upon our present state. Two whole years without war in Europe. And after such Peace Treaties, too. It is a wealth of happiness beyond the dreams of optimism. Until that Utopian dream is realised, and life rather than slaughter becomes the attribute of Christendom, might we not just as well leave a Sultan......where he is ? No Sultan has ever made a

bloodier hash of his Empire than our Christian governors have made of Europe. —*The Nation*, January 17, 1920.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES

It will be seen that Mr. Bury refers to 'spurious Pan-Islamism'. That does not mean that all pan-Islamism spurious quite the reverse. It is a real thing—a sincere attempt to weld together Muslims throughout the world regardless of nationality. It is more than a spiritual movement; it is 'a practical working proposition, which has to be reckoned with when dealing with Muslims even in secular matters.'... Missionaries make few converts among Muslims and the Muslim missionaries are beating their Christian rivals among the pagans, the reason being that 'Islam offers equal privileges and no colour line, imposes easy spiritual obligations, and is propagated fervently by its followers without the encumbrance of an organised priesthood.' We may make one other quotation from Mr. Bury's long and reasoned argument on this theme.

'Do proselytising missionaries in the Islamic field ever sit down and think what they are really trying to do ? Does the social ostracism of a human being, the damnation of his folk and the salvation of none but a remnant of mankind mean anything to them ? If so, they ought to be overcome with horror-unless it is their idea of humour, which I cannot believe. To pester a man into abandoning a perfectly sound and satisfying religion for one which may not suit him so well is more reprehensible than badgering a man to go to your doctor when his own physician understands his case, and has studied it a long time. At least his discarded medical adviser will not make his life a burden to him—a burden which the proselytiser does not share—

—*Daily Telegraph*, January 16, 1920.

Source. The Muslim Outlook, February, 1920.

51

LETTER FROM SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

5 February 1920

Allow me just a few words in reply to Lieut. General Tyrell's letter in your issue of January 24, and that might relieve the Lieut. General of his perplexity.

The same aspertions and motives may have impelled the Arabs to demand self-government which are impelling the Irish, the Egyptians, the Indians, and the Maltese, etc., and there can be no doubt, at least in the case

of the one, perhaps the least oppressed of them all—*i.e.*, the Irish—that they would have welcomed as their 'deliverers' the German army if it had succeeded in reaching the Irish shores to give them liberty.

Those who know the real state of affairs doubt very much indeed if the British occupation is very popular, or was ever very popular, in Mesopotamia or Syria; but suppose the people of those countries did welcome the British for the time being, may it not have been for the same reason which General Tyrell gives—*i.e.*, because the Muslims of Syria and Arabia have had no experience of the British rule, while the Irish, the Egyptians, the Indians have had that advantage ?

I claim to have been in touch with the Muslim opinion of the world for the last 20 years, and for that reason I make bold to launch a challenge to General Tyrell to bring forward a single true Muslim from any part of the world who would like the extinction of the Muslim rule in Europe or tolerate the expulsion of the Turks from the sacred Muslim cities of Adrianople and Constantinople.

It is absolutely *wrong to say* that it is only Muslims in the British Empire who are being exasperated by the threat of the *Dismemberment* of the *Empire of their Khalifa*. I know for a fact that *Russian Muslims*, through their able leader and president of the National Council of the Mussulmans of Europe and Siberia—Dadry Maksoudoff—have submitted a strong representation to the Peace Conference on the subject, and that 'it is because out of regard to the view and santiments of 20 million Muslim citizens of the French Empire that France is supporting the claims of the Turks to their Homelands in Thrace and Asia Minor, and to their Capital, and its Statesmen and Press are astounded to see that British statesmen and Press do not pay any heed to the views and sentiments of five times larger Muslim population of the British Empire, little knowing that what Great Britain relies upon is its General Dyers of Amritsar notoriety.'

Source : The Muslim Outlook, February, 1920.

52

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR, THE TIMES

4 March 1920

Although your views on the Turkish question are opposed to those of the Muslim subjects of the King, you have never refused them a hearing, and I gratefully recognise your courtesy and fairness. Will you permit me at this critical moment in the history both of Turkey and of the British Empire to

draw public attention to the certain result of the agitation that has been started against the decision of the Supreme Council, not to disturb the *status quo* in Constantinople and Thrace? Many of its supporters have held high office in the State, and some of them are destined again to have charge of its affairs, and I am grieved to see that in their zeal they have employed towards their Muslim fellow-subjects language calculated to aggravate the present unrest and ferment in India. Lord Bryce, the protagonist of the present attempt to stampede the Government, has in one of his many fulminations chosen to deride Muslim sentiment as 'shadowy terrors' to recoil before which would do harm to British prestige. I venture to say that British administrators who have been in direct touch with the Indian people would tell him differently. To call the wave of intense and united feeling that is surging over India at this moment a 'fictitious agitation' is to deliberately shut one's eyes to the gravest situation that, in the opinion of the wisest observers, has arisen within the last half century.

In 1765 a Muslim Sovereign constituted the East India Company the chief revenue official in Eastern India; in 1802 he delegated to the Company the Imperial authority. Since then the Muslims have formed one of the staunchest element in the Indian population. In the late war, tens of thousands laid down their lives in the cause of England; Muslim princes and magnates responded lavishly to the call for financial and material help, and the people at large gave their best unstintedly. The Army would probably be the first to acknowledge its debt to the Muslim soldiers in getting across the Jordan. Neither the soldiers who fought and died, nor the princes and people who regarded England's chief enemy as the common foe were told that they were helping in the last crusade and were to work for the eventual destruction of an institution and an Empire in which they are vitally interested. Had they had any inkling of the psychology at the back of the present agitation, there would have been a great searching of heart on all sides. They are now being told that, although British subjects, possessed of the same constitutional rights as their Christian fellow-subjects, entitled to the same consideration in respect of their religious sentiments and political feelings, their feelings and sentiments are of no account, and could and should be trampled upon with impunity and regardless of consequences. What will all this lead to? I cannot help regarding the future of the Empire, of India, and of the East generally, with alarm and anxiety. India is seething with rage over recent 'regrettable incidents', and here a wild fanatical agitation is set on foot with the inevitable result of inflaming the bitterest hatred and animosity on both sides.

On January 5, 1918, the Prime Minister, speaking in the name of England and the British nation, nay, of the British Empire, which includes over 100 millions of Muslims, said as follows—

'Nor are we fighting...... to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly

Turkish in race.'

This memorable declaration attained its object; it removed the doubts and apprehensions that were gaining ground and assured the steadfastness of the Muslim soldiers. Muslims universally accepted it as a solemn pledge and maintained their trust in England's honour and England's good faith. Are England's honour and good faith of no value in her world-wide Empire ? The present outcry should have been raised when the pledge was given to a trustful world in the name of the British nation. It is un-British to take all the advantage out of it and then to turn round and raise a furious hue and cry against its fulfilment. The Muslims would be justified in regarding it as a gross breach of faith which at any other moment would have evoked strong disapproval, and committed by any other nation, would have received just condemnation.

We understand that in an unwary moment, under stress of circumstance, a facile statesmanship promised Constantinople to Turkish Russia. That Russia has disappeared. Over the death of Tsarism, England did not weep. Does Liberal England propose to revive it for the purpose of holding Constantinople, or is it intended that city should be entrusted to Soviet Russia.

The pleas for wresting Constantinople from the Turkish States and subjecting its Muslim population to Christian domination of one kind or another, or forcing them to expatriate themselves 'bag and baggage' are too flimsy to bear examination. Constantinople is said to have been a cause of discord in the hands of the Turks; the discord was due to the rival ambitions of European States. Is it to be presumed that this last war has cleansed their hearts ? If not, is it supposed that an international control would prevent discord among them, or avert the war, which, you, Sir, apprehend ?

There is one strong consideration for the retention of the present *status quo* in European Turkey which does not, at this moment of religious excitement, appear to be realised. To drive the Turks out of Europe and pen them in within the plateau of Anatolia would mean that they would be debarred from free interassociation with other nations, would be deprived of all touch with the modern world, and have no chance of development. They would brood in sullen anger over their wrongs and wait for the hour of revenge. This can hardly be regarded as a solution which will bring back peace and good will to a distracted world. Security and good treatment of the Christian minorities in the Eastern districts of Anatolia would be best assured by a generous and not a vindictive settlement with Turkey. It is hardly to be expected that if the Turks are driven out from Constantinople which, as Professor Grosvenor said, is more to them than Paris to France, or Rome to Italy and is regarded as a sacred city by the Muslims in general, it would add to their good feeling towards those whose cause has been so violently advocated in England.

The sense of fair play is a predominant characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race; but in moments or religious and political execution an appeal to the

sense of fair play falls on deaf ears. And yet there are, I know, many in England who would like to hold the balance evenly between accuser and accused and not condemn a race unheard. The Turks have been called 'cruel' rulers; these 'cruel rulers' gave a generous asylum to the Jews fleeing from the gibbet and the stake in Spain. They granted absolute toleration to their non-Muslim subjects when toleration was a word unknown to Europe; they guaranteed to them the fullest enjoyment of their communal and religious rights. The Greeks, the Armenians, and the Jews have flourished under their 'cruel' rule. They have, no doubt, repressed ruthlessly risings and rebellions, fomented almost entirely from abroad. But is there any nation that has not been ruthless in the treatment of rebellion ? When the account of 'terrible crimes' is made up before an impartial jury and the balance is struck, it will not be found to be entirely against the Turks. The reports of the Russian officers in Armenia, of the Allied Commission in Smyrna, and of the Carnegie Commission in Europe might, with justice, form the basis of an unbiased trial.

I maintain that Turkey has not been allowed a dog's chance in her endeavours to reform and reorganise her administration. From the later end of the 18th century she had a war forced upon her at short intervals of 20 or 25 years in some instances the repite was less. That any nation could survive this perpetual struggle for existence might appeal to a virile race like the British. Turkey again and over again appealed to England for help to put her Government in order; her requests were invariably refused, in deference to Russia's wishes. The Tsarist policy aimed at the destruction of Turkey both in Europe and Asia, and not at her improvement.

I cannot help marvelling at the extraordinary coincidence that brought the reports of the 'massacres' at Marash two days after the announcement in the 'Temps' and other Paris papers, of the French policy in Cilicia. The first account put the number of victims as 700; next day it rose to 7,000; Saturday it fell to 1,500 In the East when an object is desired it is not difficult to achieve it. If a 'massacre' is wanted, it is easy to provoke a collision; an insult to a woman or the desecration of a place of worship sets the racial and religious animosities ablaze. A few people are killed, and the whole world is aghast at a 'massacre'. In the present instance there has been no inquiry as to how it originated, who set it in motion and how many were killed on the other side, it, whether, serves the purpose in the hands of the propagandists.

I am not an apologist; I have no desire to uphold any criminal, Muslim or Christian. I would raise my voice in favour of any nation, Buddhist, Christian, or Muslim, which I believed to be the victim of injustice, as in the present instance I consider Turkey to be. I cannot bring myself to believe that the love of justice and fair play has quite disappeared from the England I have known and loved for over 50 years. Still in that belief, I appeal to the British nation, first of all, not to condemn a people unheard; and, secondly not to allow the cherished feelings of their Muslim fellow-subjects to be trampled upon and a

gulf of bitterness and hatred created between the two great faiths within the British Empire.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March, 1920.

53

LETTER FROM SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI TO LORD CURZON

London, 30 January 1920

My Lord, I herewith submit a copy of my recent publication on the Turkish question—'The Sword against Islam'—and take the liberty to beg your Lordship the favour of going through it, although I am fully aware how very valuable your time is. I claim to have been in touch with the Muslims of different parts of the world for the last fifteen or twenty years, and have represented their views frankly in this book as on other occasions before.

What is the state of feelings of Muslims of India your Lordship must have heard from the Rt. Honourable Mr. Montague, whose statesmanlike and sympathetic attitude on the question is appreciated in India, but the British Press does not seem to realise the full significance of it. One paper went as far as to say :

'Should Turkish sovereignty be extinguished in Europe there will be a great outcry among the Indian Mahommedans, but those who know them best consider that the excitement will end in talk.'

Perhaps your Lordship will remember that what is suggested in the above quotation as regards the 'Fanatic and militant' Muslims was thought of the 'mild and cowardly' Bengalees at the time of the partition of Bengal. But it proved that the excitement of the Bengalees instead of ending in talk resulted in the introduction of bombs and anarchy in India. There is no doubt that the excitement of the Muslims will end at least in the introduction of Bolshevism in India. The French and Italian papers have not left it a secret that it is the British Foreign Office which is urging the expulsion of the Crescent or Islam (Both are the same at present) from Europe—even from Muslim Thrace, Adrianople and Constantinople. Thus in the eyes of Muslims Great Britain will become the chief enemy of Islam as it is considered to be the chief enemy of the Bolshevists, and a mutual community of interests will be created between Islam and Bolshevism.

Your Lordship is in a better position than many other British statesmen to gauge the intensity of the present Muslim feelings, and of the change that has taken place in their attitude towards Great Britain. As Viceroy of India your

Lordship must have found Muslims extremely loyal and even subservient to the British officials. They, then, refused to make a common cause with their Hindu brothers. They kept themselves aloof from all political agitation, and even from the Indian National Congress. They started anti-Congress movement. They hailed the partition of Bengal. They smashed up the Hindu boycott and Swadeshi movement. They sided with the I.C.S. men in supporting their claims and in opposing simultaneous examination. Their representatives in the Councils were always with the official members so much so that later on they opposed the late Mr. Gokhale's Bill for free and compulsory education, and supported such measures as the Press Act. In short, but a few years ago Muslims in India were enmasse with the British and they paid no attention to one or two radical men they possessed.

What is the case now ? Politically Muslims and Hindus have joined hands. There has been fraternisation even on the occasion of religious festivals of both communities respectively. Muslims freely attend the National Congress although they have their own political organisation—the All-India Muslim League—which holds its session at the same place as the Congress and passes almost identical resolutions. It is Muslims now who are mostly 'extremists'. It was the Muslims who proposed first to boycott the recent official Peace celebrations in India, and were joined by the Hindus later on. It is Muslim leaders who cheerfully court internment and imprisonment. It is Muslims who hold Khilafat days in every village and hamlet of India. The same Muslims who opposed boycott during your Lordship's Viceroyalty have now themselves appointed a Committee of leading Indians to formulate practical schemes for the boycott of British goods successfully and progressively and to stop co-operation with the British officials. Khilafat Committees have been organised all over India. The effectiveness of the Muslim organisation was tested and on proclaiming a day for strike even the Stock Exchange of Bombay had to be closed.

All this change, which certainly is more than mere talk, has taken place because of the threatening attitude of Great Britain against Turkey. The seed of hatred against the British is being steadily sown in the mind of Muslims, and foundations are being laid for new crusades and holy wars. The British Press is crying aloud that not even a handful of Christians should remain under the Muslim rule. This cry will naturally be re-echoed from the East and from the home of a solid mass of 82 million Muslims that no Muslim should live under Christian rule. The cry of Islamiah irredenta will pass from mosque to mosque. For the present Muslims are powerless from a military point of view. This is the more reason why they will seek the help of Bolshevism or any other Power which will help them in rehabilitating the position of Islam in Europe as in Asia. Whatever cloak may be put on it, the fact cannot be concealed from the Muslim eyes that the cry of turning out the Turks bag and baggage from Europe is prompted only by the inherent hatred against the religion which has been openly styled the 'antagonistic

faith', *i.e.*, Islam. There can be no other reason for this threat of turning out the Turks from such places as have been admitted by Mr. Lloyd George himself to be their homelands—like Thrace (both Western and Eastern), Adrianople, Constentinople, Asia Minor, where admittedly Muslims preponderate. Adrianople and Constantinople both are now not only essentially Islamic towns, but they represent the culture and civilisation of Islam to-day as no other town in the world represents it. Muslim colleges, hospitals, Mosques, libraries, and other buildings and institutions abound in the Darulsaadat (the House of Bills)—Constantinople—as nowhere else in the world. Unless a deliberate act of vendalism is meant to be carried out of destroying the centre of Islamic civilisation, neither Adrianople nor Constantinople should be touched at all. Under international or any other non-Muslim control they can no more remain the centre. That small portion of Europe which is now left to Islam is the point of contact between the East and West. The tendency of the age should be to harmonise the East and West the peoples of different races, colours, religions, civilisations and cultures, and not to separate them. For this reason also Europe and Christendom should rise above bigotry and fanaticism and extend a helping hand to the Muslim Turks instead of treating them as outcastes, as they have done so far.

If the natural and rightful owners are ousted from Adrianople or Constantinople, these places are sure to become an apple of discord between the Balkan States as well as bigger Powers, even though for the time being they may be internationalised. Experiment has shown that internationalisation does not contribute much to the prosperity of any place.

In one of his recent speeches, Mr. Lloyd George said that because the Turks closed the Straits in the last war against France and England, therefore, they should no more be allowed to remain in charge. If once in four or five centuries the Turks went against France and England, how many times did they render help, from the same position, both to France and to England, and what guarantee can there be that any other State or States that are given the charge of the Straits may not go against France and England ? France and England themselves may not remain friendly for ever. Looked at from any point of view, political or religious, the homelands of the Turks where Muslims admittedly preponderate, should not be disturbed. There is also a moral reason for respecting the homelands of the Turks. Your Lordship paid a compliment to the late Nizam of Hyderabad that he was a man of his words and would not go back upon them even if it cost him any loss. The King, in his message to India at the outbreak of the war, said : 'Paramount regard for treaty, faith and the pledged word of rulers and peoples is the common heritage of England and India.' Mr. Lloyd George pledged his word on behalf of the whole Empire on 5 January 1918, that Great Britain had no aims 'to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race.... We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands

of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople.'

Nor were those homelands of the Turks—Thrace, Adrianople, Constantinople, and Asia Minor—challenged under the Armistice terms with Turkey. Why, then, are they challenged now ? It is because now Great Britain finds herself to be in a stronger military position and believes that she can dictate any terms she likes ? Intoxicated by its military power shall England—shall those British statesmen who have a personal gentlemenly instinct and even a legitimate pride in their honour, fail to redeem British words given out at a time of crisis when the prospects of the war were gloomy and when Muslims had to be placated ?

In certain papers it has been said that those were not words of promise but only an offer. What difference can it make whether they were words of promise or of offer if they were not used simply to deceive the Turks or other Muslims ? Either they were tokens of an honourable promise and a faithful description of the British war aims, or they were meant to be a most perfidious strategy or opportunism.

I would draw your Lordship's attention to the following words in this connection which are from a memorial presented to the Prime Minister under the joint signatures of responsible Englishmen, some of whom have held responsible civil and military positions. In India, like Lord Ampthill and Carmichael, Sir Francis Younghusband, Sir Theodore Morison, Colonel Durand, Sir J. P. Hewett, etc. etc. :

'This declaration is now widely known in India and there is little probability of its being forgotten. If you are unable to persuade the Powers at the Peace Conference to fulfil the pledges then given, we fear that the Mahommedans will consider it a breach of faith for which they will hold England responsible. No Indian administrator can contemplate this possibility with equanimity. Hitherto we had a reputation for good faith in India which has been one of the most valuable assets in the Empire. We cannot hope to retain it if we fail to keep our word upon a subject like this.'

The Muslims should be assured that once the British Prime Minister declared that the war was not to deprive the Turks of Thrace, Constantinople, Asia Minor, once that he admitted these to be the homelands of the Turks and their right to live there undisturbed, and once that the Turks signed an Armistice on that understanding and the Indian Muslims helped Great Britain on that assurance in the war against their brethren, now, even if the heavens were to fall and the earth were to move, England would refuse to be a party to any undertaking that would involve the breach of British good faith.

As regards the non-Turkish portions of the Muslim Empire, your Lordship knows that Islam does not recognise any racial and national boundaries, Syria, Mesopotamia, Hadjaz, all are peopled preponderantly by Arabs, who acknowledge the same faith as the Turks, and have the same culture and civilisation. Sharif Husain, although he revolted from the political sovereignty of the Turks, and Muslims of the world, therefore, consider him to be

a rebel he still recognises the Ottoman Sultan as the Khalifa. While Islam does not recognise the divison of human brotherhood into nations, it forbids that any Muslim should hold any other Muslim individual or race under subjection against its will. If the Arabs desire to be autonomous, as Indians themselves desire, and if they have any quarrel with their Turkish brothers over that, it will be a duty of other Muslims assigned by the Quran itself to effect a reconciliation between the two, provided that the Khalifate of the Ottoman Sultan is not disturbed, and unless Muslims find out thatthe Christian Powers encourage a quarrel between the Arabs and the Turks, either with a view to weaken Islam or to bring the Arabs of Syria or Mesopotamia under their own subjection under the cover of mandate or openly. No Muslim is willing to rise the question of the Khilafat at the bidding of Christian States, or because it suit Christians to create schism. The democracy of Islam does not recognise special rights and privilege of any race or people, or claim or dynasty.

In a debate in the House of Lords on April 20, 1915, when your Lordship was also present, Lord Cromer, who knew something of the constitution of Islam, said : 'I think we might go so far as to give them (Muslims) some sort of assurance that we recognise that the Caliph should be not only a Muslim, but a Muslim of such position as to be independent of any European pressure of any kind or sort.' In the same debate, Lord Crewe, on behalf of the Government, and presumably by you Lordship's consent also, gave the following pledge : 'It is not for us, I will not say, to attempt to impose a Caliph on the Muslim world, but even to bring about by forcible means a situation which would in practice compel the choice to fall upon a particular individual.' Lately, in certain irresponsible quarters, it has been suggested that the Khilafat should be divorced from the Sultanate as if Islam also recognised any Pope, or any such bifurcation of religions and secular headship. The Holy Prophet of Islam himself united in his person both sort of leaderships. He was at the same time the religious head of the Muslims and the President of the Muslim Commonwealth. Regarding non-Muslim subjects of the Muslim Khalifa, Islam itself lays down in clearest possible terms that not only their lives and properties but even all their religious institution should be safe-guarded and assured a security. The interests of non-Muslim minorities in every city and province or federated states of the Turkish Empire should be as carefully safeguarded as they have been of the Jews, etc., in Christian states. But at the same time it will be but just to expect that the interests and lives of Muslim minorities in Greece, Servia and Bulgaria shall also be perfectly safeguarded by means of special treaties. Muslims expect that the Muslim state of Albania, which had its recognised independent status before the war, shall, under a Muslim ruler, be an independent state.

Your Lordship will, on mature consideration, find that the demands of Muslims of India as regards the Empire of their Khalifa are very reasonable, and that their fulfilment will not only preserve the Muslim Empire as a blessing to humanity and a means of peace and the status of Islam among other

religions and civilisations, but will also strengthen the position of Great Britain herself.

The Muslim nation has proved many a time before the bulwork of the British Empire in the East. The soldiers of Turkey herself have died shoulder to shoulder with their British comrades. The Russian menace to the British Empire in the East is far from dead yet. Through Turkey England was able to weaken that menace. It was the Turkey who directed to themselves the greatest violence of the menace, that avalanche.

The Russian menace, which will before long be augmented by German co-operation, can neither be crushed by the establishment of petty border states nor single-handed by Great Britain herself.

The little war which England has lately had with Afghanistan must have convinced British statesmen that it is not easy to oppose foreign foes, even when weak and small, with internal unrest.

The Russian menace, and it will be more terrible now when better organised than it was during the Czarist regime, can only be crushed if it can be crushed at all, by a strong, powerful and independent Turkey, supported by an independent and powerful Persia. Unless these Empires are themselves independent, the people will have not heart to put up a fight against a nation which would promise liberty and independence.

If Great Britain enters into an offensive and defensive permanent alliance with Turkey and Persia, then, and then alone, will she be able not only to have two Powers imbued with national spirit to support her against the German-Russian menace attacking the British Empire at points where the British Navy cannot reach, but she will also ensure the sympathy and co-operation of Islam. Then the small buffer states will also prove an effective breakwater.

On the contrary, if she allows herself to be carried away by the cry of turning out the Crescent and Islam from Europe, and of keeping Christians free from the rule of the 'infidels' (monotheistic Muslims are still considered by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the heathens because they refuse to worship a man), she will have to fight the battles not only against the German-Russian combination, but also a Bolshevik-Islamic combination.

Your Lordship, as a student of history, knows that Islam can put up still fights even if indifferently armed. In self-defence Islam arouses a victorious, an all-conquering spirit. It is not only for open fight and sacrifices that Islam imbues a vigorous spirit, what the 'Men of the Mountain', or *Hashisheen*, did, has shown that Islamic Constitution can be manipulated even by workers in secret to be a terror to mighty Powers. To Muslims, death in the cause of Islam guarantees eternal life. Strongest Press acts and meeting acts etc. will be of no avail against the Constitution of Islam and the *Fatwas* of Ulema, unless all Muslim theologians are hanged, all the Mosques are closed, all the sermons from the pulpit prohibited, the pilgrimage to the Holy Cities forbidden and each copy of the Quran destroyed.

It might be a very pious Christian sentiment to free the sacred soil of Europe from the 'heathen' Muslim Turk, but will it be worth the price it will cost in human blood, in human misery, is a question to be taken into consideration. It might be easy from a military point of view to expel the Turks from Europe, or even to annihilate them, but no power on the face of this earth can annihilate Islam, and as long as Islam lives the destruction of the most valiant sons of Islam shall yet be avenged. The teaching of Islam is : 'In retaliation is your life,' and retaliation there shall be, Islam will not forget that Muslim toleration in Spain, in Malta, in Sicily, and now in Eastern Europe has proved a bane for the Muslims themselves, if Muslim theologians had not stopped the hands of Salim I, then to-day Europe would have found no Christians in the Balkans to free. But Muslims even in those days, which are called days of barbarism, were far more tolerant than those statesmen of to-day who are piously advocating the expulsion of the Crescent from Europe.

Now that the last valiant nation that fought to uplift the banner of Islam in Europe and Asia has been defeated, the Muslim nation must seek an alliance with some other power to rehabilitate the status of Islam. The question which is at present passing in the minds of thinking Muslims is whether that power shall be the new and rising power of Bolshevism or the old and tried power of Great Britain. Naturally, Muslims are for the present more inclined towards the alter, but if Great Britain herself adopts the position of the chief enemy of Islam, Muslims will have no alternative left. There are a few Muslims who will no more be reconciled to Great Britain because they think that Great Britain has already gone too far in the enmity of Islam. But, with a favourable policy towards Turkey, there is no doubt that the masses will be for Great Britain.

And what benefit does England expect to get by destroying Turkey ? It is true that British statesmen of learning like your Lordship have naturally a regard for the old Greek culture and civilisation, and may be inclined to bestow Muslim Thrace, and even sacred Adrianople, upon the Greeks as a token of this appreciation of the old Hellenic civilisation and also with a view to have a strong friend in the Balkans. But I am convinced that a statesman of your Lordship's acumen, knowledge, and experience knows how little modern Greeks have of the old Hellenes. Besides this, is there any nation which ever appreciated more and did greater service to the old Hellenic culture than the Muslim nation ? All that was good in Greek culture Europe realised through Mussulmans. Why, then, should Europe be ungrateful to Mussulmans and be ready to do them the greatest injustice that could ever be done to any nation, *i.e.*, to wrench from the Muslim nation the seats of its culture and civilisation and to treat its people like cattle and to give them over to the rule of their enemies against their will ? The seat of Islamic civilisation to-day is in Constantinople, not in Hejaz. As to having a strong friend in the Balkans, can Great Britain really depend upon the Greeks ? What has even the late war demonstrated ? And will not strengthening the

Greeks cause an envy in the minds of other Balkan States and increase their mutual ill-will ?

Turkey and Turkey alone can be the best policemen for the Balkans.

Even in the Dardanelles the Turks have power, and will continue to be the best guardians, otherwise the Russian Navy, and particularly Russian submarines, will cause much trouble to Great Britain in the Mediterranean. If the Dardanelles are internationalised the chances of international trouble will increase. A slight misunderstanding between Russia and Greece, or Italy and Bulgaria and Greece, will cause international anxiety. One natural effect of opening up the Dardanelles will be to encourage all the States in the Black Sea littoral to possess big navies, and Russia will no doubt try to become a big naval Power, so that if internationalisation of the Straits does not only remain a farce, but a really open gate for the navies of all Powers, Russia will be able to exert a world influence by having a strong navy in the Black Sea. This will increase the world danger as well as the world's armament. A suggestion is thrown out in the Press that Great Britain wants to keep Constantinople handy to offer as a bribe to Russia when she covets India again. There is a Persian saying which means that to those who have a hunger for conquest if you give the whole of this world they will clamour for the other. Russia will no doubt accept the bribe with thanks, but will most probably use this further strengthened position to attack the British Empire in the East with greater vigour.

It is quite true that the Turks joined in the late war with the enemies of France and England, although they had no grievance against France in any case, and that, therefore, it is incumbent upon the British and French statesmen to base the future settlement with an eye upon a possible repetition of the same eventuality, and also to give due punishment to the Turks for having fought against the *Entente*.

Everybody can see that certain combinations in the late war were very unnatural indeed. That two hereditary enemies like Russia and Great Britain, or the Turks and the Bulgars, should have joined hands in nothing but an unnatural phenomenon. No less unnatural is that Turkey should go to war against France and Engalnd. But it would be a grave mistake if an unnatural phenomenon should be taken to be normal and the permanent settlement should be based upon it.

As to punishing the Turks, they have been more than punished already. What they have suffered during the War is indescribable. And what they have suffered since the so-called Armistice is nothing short of barbarious torture, especially at the hands of their mean, spiteful enemy, Greece, which has behaved as if she was the sole conqueror of Turkey, although she has taken no real or effective part in conquerring any portion of Turkey. Even such portions of the Turkish Empire that had not suffered any disorder, as Smyrna, have been terribly ravaged without the slightest excuse or justification. Thousands of Muslim men, women and children have been butchered in cold

blood and hundreds of thousands have had to fly for their lives. Hundreds of thousands of refugees are now in Constantinople, breadless and homeless. The only shelter they possess is of the mosques. While Christian people have organised missions and sent hundreds of thousands of pounds to relieve the sufferings of their co-religionists, Muslim men, women and children have been left to die of starvation and want of clothing without any effort to relieve them. I asked your Lordship's permission to be allowed to go to Constantinople and other parts of the Muslim Empire with a mission, but in reply I was told that the only relief that could be offered to the Muslims was through the agency of a Christian clergyman, and that a sum of £ 800 was sent through him by a Red Crescent organisation. What is the state of affairs in Constantinople ? Even Greek men-of-war are there aiming their guns upon the palace of the Khalifa. The Entente Powers have thought it fit to occupy the Turkish capital and to take Greek soldiers also with them there, although they did not send any army to any capital of their other three enemies – not even to Berlin. Insults have been added to injury. Every humiliation has been offered and is being offered to the people and the Government. Respectable men, even princes, have been unceremoniously caught hold of and deported to foreign lands. Peace is being delayed, and that may eventually lead to disorders and rebellions, because all the State machinery is being disorganised by this chronic state, which is neither war nor peace. But for the fact that Islamic peoples are always better disciplined and self controlled, sober and god-fearing, anarchy, if not Bolshevism, would have long found its way in the sorely tried people of Turkey. In short, there is no doubt that the punishment which has already been inflicted upon the Turks, their State and Government (both past and present) ought to satisfy even the most revengeful and blood-thirsty mind.

God Almighty knows how the hearts of Muslims bleed for their brothers in Turkey. They suffer it calmly because they take it to be a result of the war that has ended in defeat. But it will be too much to expect that they will be passive on lookers for ever if this torture is indefinitely continued, or if to the humiliation of the Turks a humiliation of Islam is also added. Its sacred cities, taken over by one or a group of Christian Powers, its adherents given over to the mercy of non-Muslims, its Khalifa relegated to the position of a petty ruler. The Muslims of India who have always realised, and not only realised, but have faithfully carried out their citizen duty, have urged upon the British statesmen times out of number the necessity of an alliance between Turkey and Great Britain on Mutual equality and independence. They have urged the same for Persia. With such an alliance they could remain true to their August Faith and their secular Empire. This loyalty to the State has been tried by the ordeal of fire. They have not wavered in this trial.

But when there is a duty for the citizens there is also a duty for the State. The State should also give due regard to the views, interests and sentiments of its citizens. Will Great Britain fail in its duty towards its citizens ? The

Hindus and Muslims are united on the point that the integrity and independence of Turkey should be maintained. Do the British delegates, when they go to the Conference, realise the fact that they are not only the representatives of 40 million peoples of Great Britain, but also of 300 million peoples of India ? The 300 million people are not technically Christians—I say technically because I believe that Muslims are good Christians—yet they are the citizens of the same Empire and they have born all the burdens of citizenship. As far as Turkey is concerned, it was not only through the Indian Army that victory was gained, but even to-day it is the Indian Army which is mainly garrisoning the occupied portions of the Turkey Empire.

There are three points which the British delegates to the Peace Conference, when it meets to settle peace with Turkey, would do well not to allow to be obscured in their mind. (1) That all Indians are fully and unshakably convinced that Great Britain has a dominating voice in the settlement of peace with Turkey, and that, unfortunately, it is the British statesmen who are showing the greatest hostility to Turkey. The French and Italian Press both have made it clear that their people and Government are not in favour of expelling the banner of Islam from Europe, and there is not the least doubt in the mind of any single Indian that if Mr. Lloyd George were to keep firm to his words uttered on January 5, 1918, neither France nor Italy nor America would raise any objection. They also know that it is the oil-fields of Mesopotamia, and the memory of the crusades that have been the chief incentives of the invention of 'mandates'. If Great Britain were to keep honourably and straightforwardly to her words that the war was fought to guarantee the independence of all the weak and strong nations, and let there be a fully self-governing federation of Arab States, the Arabs have no objection to making a permanent alliance with their parent Empire of Turkey and to acknowledge the supremacy of their Khalifa. If Great Britain would not covet Mesopotamia and Palestine, neither France nor Italy would demand any portions of the Ottoman Empire.

(2) Thesecond point is that it will be impossible to expect peace in the East, and particularly in India, if the Turkish Empire is dismembered, with a view to humiliate Islam or with a view to increase pressure upon India, so as to keep it under a sort of perpetual domination. Why the Hindus have joined the Mussulmans is because they see that the present policy of British statesmen aims at perpetual domination over India by trying to destroy or weaken all such independent states which were likely to have any sympathy with the legitimate and natural aspiration of the people of India. The one result of the military victory of Great Britain in the recent war was noticed not long ago at Gujranwala and Amritsar, etc.

(3) The third point for the British Peace delegates to keep in mind is that now the question of Turkey is no more a purely Turkish question concerning only 20 million peoples or only a secular sovereign whose armies have been overwhelmed in the war. They should never forget that the question of

Turkey is the question of Islam, that the Sultan of Turkey is also the Khalifa of the Muslims world, that Islam has not been defeated. Even if through intimidation, bribery or flattery Turkey is made to sign any humiliating peace the Muslim world will not recognise it, and will consider mean to counteract it. It is true that the honour of Islam has been for centuries in the hands of the Turks, and that they have sacrificed their lives freely to keep that honour, although assailed on all sides by Christian States and Powers. It is true that they are endeavouring even now to maintain that honour, and, in Anatolia, even women are preparing to fight to the end for the same honour of Islam. But the Muslim world appreciates the difficulties of the Ottoman Government at Constantinople, and although fully expecting that no Muslim worth the name will be found to sign a humiliating peace, and that the Muslims of Thrace, Adrianople and Constantinople will not allow the Muslim Government to be moved until all are dead, yet if a humiliating peace is forced upon the Ottoman Government the indignation of Islam will be against those who force not against those who are helpless. My Lord, it is undeniably within the reach of practical politics to strengthen the British Empire by making India a self-respecting, contented unit of the British Commonwealth, and to obtain all that is best in the 300 million people for the enhancement of the glory and strength of the British Empire by respecting the views, aspirations and sentiments of the people of India, whether in regard to the internal affairs of the country, or to those external affairs in which its citizens are vitally interested. India, will not allow herself to be ignored either by Great Britain or by other Powers of the world. If she is fit to be a member of the proposed League of Nations her voice must be heard by all the powers in such matters as affect her citizens in any way. When peace with Germany was discussed and signed she had a few representatives even though they were not chosen by her people. When peace with Turkey is discussed she will claim a right not only of nominal representation but of a powerful and real representation of her own sons and an effective voice to help her Minister for Foreign Affairs in asserting the voice of Great Britain, and to see that racial and religious prejudices do not overpower other delegates so as to lose sight of her interests.

Source : Muslim Outlook, February, 1920.

54

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, CALCUTTA

28-29 February 1920

Moulana Abul Kalam Azad presided, and prominent part was taken by Moulana Abdulbari Saheb of Ferangi Mahal, Shaukat Ali, Hasrat Mohani, Shaikh Mushir Hussain Kidwai of Gondia, Honourable Abdul Kasim, Honourable Fazlul Haq, Mr. Harilal Gandhi, Mr. Rai Kunjul Lal Singh, Mr. Gulam Hussain Kassim Ariff, Pundit Suresh Chandra Pal Samajpati, Mr. Nujmuddin, Dr. Kitchlew, and other Hindus and Muslims.

The following resolutions were passed : (1) Denouncing the attitude of the Archbishop of Centerbury and other Christian prelates and statesmen, in most emphatic, strong, and indignant language; (2) warning the authorities that Muslims would be compelled to cease all relations of loyalty to the British Government, if peace with Turkey be against the religious injunction, and that they would be duty bound to assist the Khalifa against his enemies; (3) repeatedly expressing their deep devotion to the persons of Khalifas and asserting the present Sultan with his predecessors is the Khalifa and spiritual head of the Muslim world; (4) expressing deep indignation at the direct or indirect attempt of England and Allies to destroy the Khilafat and to dismember Turkey in violation of equity, justice, freedom, self-determination, and international and political morality; (5) declaring in clear and unambiguous terms that, if the Peace Conference should dismember the Turkish Empire, and place Mesopotamia, Syria, and other Holy Places under non-Muslim control or influence in violation of Islamic requirements and in utter disregard of Indian Muslim demand, it would be the duty of Mussulmans to have recourse to every possible means to keep the Khilafat intact and to maintain the position and the dignity of the Khalifa, and that the Mussulmans would not sever from these determination, even if Turkey be forced to accept unfavourable settlements; (6) denouncing Great Britain's declaration of protectorate over Egypt, depriving Egyptians of their birth-right of freedom; (7) as all constitutional efforts have failed to produce appreciable results — even wholesale expulsion of the Turks from Europe was asserted not to produce unrest among Indian Muslims — there remains no alternative but to adopt extreme measures and to fix March 19 for the general suspension of all businesses, and to send a final message to the Viceroy and the King-Emperor that, if the Khilafat and Holy Places questions be decided against Muslim demands and the Shariat, under the dictates of Islam, the loyalty of Indian Muslims could not be kept intact; (8) His Majesty's Muslim Forces were appealed to impress upon their officers that if the above-mentioned questions

be decided against Muslim demand, they would sever all connection with the British Government, as otherwise they would be socially ostracised; (9) Hindu and Muslim rulers of Native States were appealed to co-operate; (10) boycott of British piece-goods was inaugurated and co-operation of non-Muslim countrymen sought; (11) attempts of Mustafah Kamal Pasha and Enver Pasha and other Turkish Nationalists for the maintenance of the Khilafat and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire were wholeheartedly appreciated, and the attempts of creating prejudice against them by the Allies were condemned; (12) Muslim members of the Imperial and the Provincial Legislative Councils, and title-holders were requested to follow the example of the Honourables Fazlul Haq and Abdul Kasim; (13) deep sense of sorrow and indignation was expressed in spite of the Royal Proclamation; (14) highly respected religious leader Moulana Mohmud Hussain of Deobund has not yet been released, nor any information given; (15) as an hostile attitude is kept towards Turkey by England and her Allies, the people have been requested not to join the Army, Labour corps, ships, or to render any pecuniary help (any such help if given will be haram (irreligious) according to Islam), and to cut off connections with those who should help; (16) non-Muslims have been requested not to help the British Government in recruitment, or in any other way.

FINAL PROTEST

At the first meeting of the Bengal Khalifat Conference, which was largely attended (says Reuter), a resolution was passed denouncing the attitude of the Archbishop of Centerbury and various Christian statesmen towards the Turkish Empire, and declaring that if the Khalifa's dominions are not kept intact as they were before the war, Mahommedans will be compelled to withdraw their loyalty to Britain, and will assist the Khalifa against all his enemies by every means.

Another Reuter message from Calcutta says a resolution was passed stating that, since protests had been unavailing, all business would be suspended on March 19 and a final message sent to the Viceroy and the King-Emperor stating that if Mahommedan feeling were not respected the Conference must sever all connections with the British Government.

Those failing to comply with this edict were to be socially ostracised. The Conference hoped to receive Hindu co-operation.

A further resolution urged a Mahommedan boycott of British piece-goods with the co-operation of non-Muslims.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March, 1920.

55

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND BY THE LONDON MUSLIM LEAGUE

2 March 1920

1. I am desired by the Committee of the London Muslim League, speaking for and on behalf of our co-religionists in India, to place most respectfully before His Majesty's Government and the Supreme Council, our deep concern at the fate of our fellow. Muslims in Asia Minor and Thrace, and to submit certain considerations on which we respectfully beg to lay stress as determining factors in the impending settlement of the Turkish State in Asia Minor.

2. Throughout Asia Minor, from the Ægean Sea to the western boundaries of Persian Kurdistan, the population is preponderantly Muslim by faith. The respective figures of the different communities inhabiting this tract of country were given in a memorial submitted to His Majesty's Government on the 12th of December last by an influential body of British and British-Indian subjects of the King. It would be perfectly possible to verify our statement as to the preponderance of the Muslim population throughout this area by an investigation conducted by an impartial Allied Commission.

3. We beg to affirm most emphatically that in the Province of Smyrna (Aidin) the Muslim population, at the time of the Greek landing at Smyrna, numbered six times as many as the Greeks. What happened at, and after, that memorable landing are matters of history, but has not been used by Muslims for propagandist agitation. On the 25 June 1919, the Committee of the London Muslim League submitted to you, Sir, a Representation in which they called your attention to the unfortunate and tragical effect on the Muslim subjects of His Majesty 'of the fate of the Muslims who were being transferred from one sovereignty to another, like so many cattle, without any voice in its determination'.

4. An Allied Commission was sent for an enquiry into the excesses committed by the Greek troops, a l although its report has not been published; we believe that the allegations made in the London Muslim League's Representation are fully borne out. We have learnt from British eye-witnesses of the horrors that have been perpetrated, the devastation and damage that have been committed in a tract of country which was, until then, flourishing and prosperous. 'Ten thousand killed; several thousand missing; nearly 1,00,000 homeless refugees in the depth of misery; farms wiped out; villages devastated.' Such is the account we have received; and we take the liberty to assert that they are not open to contradiction.

5. In the face of these facts we feel sure that His Majesty's Government

and the Supreme Council will be pleased to hold that our plea for our fellow-Muslims of that part of Asia Minor is based on every consideration of humanity and justice. First, the Greeks have no right to that province on the supposed ground that Greeks form the majority of the population; on the country, the Muslims are in an overwhelming majority. It would be an outrage on humanity to subject the vast majority of Muslims to Greek rule, which must and would be conducted from outside; it would be in violation of all the principles of justice, fair-play, and 'self-determination' which the Allies and Associated Powers placed at the forefront of their world settlement during the War. If the plea is unheeded by the Supreme Council the fugitive Muslims could not return to their devastated homes and to the tender mercies of the Greeks. The country would remain a desert; already British merchants, we understand, who possessed prosperous industries in the interior are suffering from want of tillers of the soil.

6. Smyrna is the only outlet of any value on the Ægean for the products of Turkey from the interior. The loss of Smyrna would mean economic death to Turks. Crippled, mangled, deprived of the only outlet for her products, she would become hopelessly bankrupt and a ruined State. We appeal to His Majesty's Government and the Supreme Council of investigation from the British merchants regarding the effects of leaving Smyrna in Greek hands on British trade.

7. We pray, therefore, in the name of humanity, justice and the sacred rights of self-determination for the retrocession to Turkey of the Province and of the port of Smyrna.

8. With regard to Cilicia on 'the rich plains' of which the Armenians have set their heart, and for the attainment of which every device has been and is being employed, we beg to state that the conflicts and murders that are reported in glaring colours in the British Press are the result of violent racial animosities excited by the threat of severing that Province from the Turkish State, and placing the Muslims, who form an overwhelming majority in the population, under Armenian rule. We respectfully submit that coercive action would only aggravate the evil by intensifying the mutual hatred. For the restoration of peace and normal conditions, measures for reconciliation and appeasement among the two communities, Muslim and Christian, are essentially needed. France and England, with the help, if necessary, of representatives from both communities, we feel sure, can achieve that desirable result; but to sever Cilicia from Turkey and to turn it into an Armenian State would mean a death-blow to peace in that part of Asia. It would throw Asia Minor and the adjacent countries into a welter of racial and religious war. As the Moslem majority will never consent to be ruled by Armenians there will be continuous strife, accompained by murders of which only one-sided accounts will reach Europe. It would entail on England the necessity of maintaining a large army for the preservation of peace amongst the warring elements. No amount of threat or coercion exercised at Cons-

tantinople would help the Turkish Government to prevent conflicts which would mostly originate in the expropriated districts and would react on the Moslem population in the districts in the possession of Turkey. The conflict and strife in Asia Minor would keep alive the bitter sense of injustice which now prevails in India, and every coercion exercised over Turkey would be regarded as an attempt to destroy the last vestige of independence left to a Moslem State, in whose continued existence the Moslems of India are vitally interested.

9. We beg respectfully to urge that Asia now needs most actual peace and reconciliation. If the different elements constituting the population of Asia Minor are to live in peace, if war and strife are to be avoided, the problem of Cilicia should be treated on the basis of justice; it should be left as a part of Turkish and proper means devised for the purpose of bringing about peace and the restoration of order without partisanship or vindictiveness.

Source: Three Memorials submitted to the Right Hon'ble the Prime Minister respecting the Turkish Settlement by the Muslim League.

56

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED TO PRIME MINISTER BY THE LONDON MUSLIM LEAGUE

4 March 1920

On behalf of the London Muslim League, I beg most respectfully to express our amazement at the report in the Press that it is proposed by the Peace Conference to deprive Turkey of the whole of Thrace including Adrianople, save and except a small enclave around Constantinople. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that the report can be true, for such a decision would be in absolute contradiction of your memorable declaration of the 5th January, 1918, which you, Sir, to the satisfaction of all His Majesty's Muslim subjects emphatically reaffirmed in the House of Commons on the 25th of February last. There is no question that the population of Thrace is preponderantly Muslim in faith and Turkish by race. It is also undisputed that the Turkish administration in that Province has, so far as we are aware, not been subject to hostile criticism on the score of harshness to its non-Muslim subjects. We can imagine no reason for the expropriation of the bulk of that Province excepting punishment.

If the report be true we beg to enter an emphatic protest against the decision.

We also take the liberty to say that when the news reaches the Muslim population of India it will have an extremely disturbing effect; .it will deepen the feeling that Turkey has been severely and vindictively dealt with.

We also learn that Turkey is to be so shorn of her territories as to leave her a population of not over six millions. This decision again will create a most painful impression among the Muslim subjects of the King who have been pleading incessantly for just and generous treatment of the Turkish Sovereign and the Turkish State, and will be regarded as the greatest humiliation to which Caliph-Sultan has as yet been subjected. This decision also does not appear to us to be consistent with the pledge you gave, Sir, to the Muslim world on behalf of the British nation that the lands in Asia Minor predominently occupied by the Turkish people will not be taken away from them.

In conclusion, we again venture respectfully to plead that in order to restore peace in Western Asia and to bring about appeasement to the Muslim subjects of the King, the Turkish Sovereign and the Turkish State should not be treated vindictively nor subjected to humiliation, as would certainly be the result in the mind of the Muslim world if the reports concerning the decisions of the Peace Conference be well founded.

Source : Three Memorials submitted to the Right Hon'ble the Prime Minister, respecting the Turkish Settlement by the London Muslim League.

57

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION : OFFICIAL RECEPTION AT THE INDIA OFFICE

25 March 1920

The Indian Khilafat Delegation were received by Mr. Fisher (on behalf of Mr. Montague, Secretary of State for India) on 2 March. The delegation consisted of Mr. Mohamed Ali, Mr. Syed Hossain, Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, and Mr. Hasan Mohamed Hayat, Secretary. There were also present from the India Office Sir William Duke, G.C.S.I., Mr. J.E. Shuckburgh, C.B., and Mr. S. K. Brown.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Mohamed Ali to open the case.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I think, Sir, it is probably understood by the Secretary of State that we held at Amritsar a session of the All-India Khilafat Conference during the early part of this year, when a resolution was passed for a second

time that a Delegation should proceed to Europe and America, in the first instance, to lay before His Majesty's Government and the Allies, and, of course, the Peace Conference, the point of view of the Mussulmans generally, explaining their religious obligations and sentiments, and the position of Indian Mussulmans, and also making clear to His Majesty's Government the support that Mussulmans are receiving in this matter from the vast bulk of Indian opinion.

With regard to this matter, we did not at the time know when precisely the Peace Conference would commence making a settlement with the Turks, and the Viceroy in his reply to our address even expressed the fear that we might arrive too late to be heard before the final settlement. We trust that is not the case, and we wired to the Secretary of State for India and to the Prime Minister immediately on landing at Venice on 22 February, urging that we should be given a full and fair hearing before any decisions were taken. We are now here, and are thankful for being received by you this evening on behalf of Mr. Montague, about whose illness we are very sorry to hear.

Before we enter into any explanation of our religious obligations and views, I should like to say that on our arrival here, and even in the course of our journey across Europe, we found that a certain kind of propaganda was being carried on by the Armenians and the Greeks and others hostile to Turkey, who have been accusing the Turks of most horrible and revolting crimes. We for our part are, to speak quite frankly, not in a position to work in the same manner here, because, in the first place, we can afford neither the money nor the morals for such a propaganda; and, in the next place, because we are not at all in touch with the Turks, who are, after all, the principal people concerned in the matter; consequently we cannot verify any accusations, however grave. But we note that in the last session of the All-India Khilafat Conference, held at Bombay on 15 and 16 February, a resolution was passed to the effect that a Delegation of Indian Mussulmans should proceed to Asia Minor as well as to other regions in the Empire of the Khilafat. When this delegation have visited the parts from which massacres are being reported at this critical moment, we shall be in a position to affirm or to deny the truth of these reports.

But our position is, above all, of a religious character. Before I go into details, I should like to mention that this question is to the Indian Mussulmans a vital question of religion.

Sometimes it is being put forward that Indian Mussulmans desire to dictate to His Majesty's Government and to the Allies. I assure you, Sir, that nothing could be farther from our minds than to use an expression that could be construed into a desire to dictate or to threaten. But the question is whether the settlement with Turkey is an affair of imperial policy or merely a question affecting Great Britain. If this is a question affecting Great Britain alone, we have nothing further to say. But if, on the contrary, it is a question affecting the whole of the Empire, as it clearly is, then we have equally clearly a *locus standi*, and the policy of the Empire can no more be dictated by Great

Britain alone than by Indian Mussulmans. It must be a common policy o the whole Empire. I think that it has been recognised by the entire communit) in India, both Mussulmans and Hindus, that things have came to such a pas: that, as subjects of His Majesty, we should be failing in our duty if we did not say how matters stand with us.

It is not a question of Moslem sentiments, if by that we understand feelings that may be changed at will. There are certain clear religious obligations imposed on us by our faith. The question of the Khilafat is not only part of our faith, but, if I may put it in that way, it is the whole of our faith. The functions of the Khilafat unite both temporal and spiritual work which Islam believes it is charged with doing. At all times since the death of the Prophet there has been a Khilafat, and it must be preserved at all times by the entire body of the Mussulmans. There has been no such thing as a merely spiritual headship of Islam. Islam, as we regard it, is the last word in ethics, and the last word in guidance in all our affairs. Therefore every act of a Mussulman's life, is, and must be, a religious act. Our duty to His Majesty is a religious duty. A man's duty to his family and his friends must be considered a religious duty. Therefore it would not be correct to try to distinguish between temporal leadership and spiritual leadership in this matter. The Khalifa is something more than a Pope. We feel there is likely to be some misunderstanding about this, and we consider it our duty to let it be known how we stand in regard to the Khilafat.

This institution, which is both temporal and religious, is, as I have said, to be preserved by the entire body of Islam. It is necessary for the Khalifa to have a certain amount of temporal power for the defence of our faith, and, although it may vary from time to time according to the strength of his possible enemies, there must always be a minimum which cannot be reduced with safety. We consider, speaking generally, that the Khalifa's power had been reduced after the Balkan War to about the minimum with which a Khalifa can maintain his dignity and act effectively as Defender of the Faith. That is why our irreducible minimum is the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*. With less than that the Mussulmans do not think the Khalifa and the Commandar of the Faithful could effectively defend our faith if in any part of the world our religious freedom came to be in jeopardy.

We do not rule out by any means political, as apart from, territorial changes. We have no objection if the Peace Conference is to consider whether autonomy could be given to various non-Turkish communities living within the Turkish Empire, whether they be Christian, Moslem, or Jew. This would coincide entirely with the twelfth point of President Wilson's fourteen points, which requires that security of life and opportunities of autonomous development should be assured to these communities. For these, guarantees may be taken from the Ottoman Government consistently with the dignity of a Sovereign State.

Then, quite apart from the main question of the preservation of the

Khilafat with adequate temporal power, there is the question of the Jazirat-ul-Arab or 'the Island of Arabia.' To European geographers Arabia is only a peninsula, bounded on the fourth side by land. But to Mussulmans it has always been an island, the fourth boundary being the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It thus includes not only Hedjaz, Yemen, Nejd, and other provinces commonly included in Arabia, but also Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. It is a religious obligation, based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, that within these limits there should be no non-Moslem control of any kind whatsoever. There was some likelihood of mandates being given to Christian Powers like America, France, and Great Britain herself within that territory. We therefore considered it our duty to explain matters to the Indian Government, and then to the English Government, and to make it clear that no Mussulmans could ever acquiesce in this. No Moslem could reconcile this to his conscience.

Mr. Fisher : I understand you to say that the Moslem conscience could not acquiesce in a mandate over a territory such as Palestine or Syria being given to a Christian Power. How, on that showing, would it be right for the Moslem conscience to acquiesce in the British sovereignty over India.

Mr. Syud Hossain : There is a great deal of difference. Arabia contains the Holy Places. It is in regard to this tract that control by non-Moslem communities is ruled out.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : Although I should be very sorry indeed to be understood to say anything at all that would tend to lessen the value of Constantinople, which has for nearly five centuries been the seat of the Khilafat, to Moslem sentiment, and to suggest that Mussulmans could willingly agree to lose any part of Dar-ul-Islam, I must say that even if Constantinople went out of Moslem hands, it would not have the same effect as if any portion of the sacred territory of the Jazirat-ul-Arab went out, or was placed under a non-Moslem mandatory. This tract, for the most part barren, has been marked out in a special manner in the various Scriptures as being the land of the Prophets, and it is probably on that account that control over every part of it is required by Islam to be entirely Moslem. We who consider ourselves to be the spiritual heirs of Abraham and Moses and Jesus, consider that this is a land apart and consecrated in a peculiar degree and reserved for us. We are charged with the duty of maintaining its sanctity inviolate, of keeping it peaceful and tranquil, a sanctuary for the Faithful, and safe for Theocracy. In order to preserve that sanctity and peace and tranquility which we desire, it is necessary that it should remain with us. It would be a sad day indeed for us when any part of it goes out of the hands of the Mussulmans, for then we would have betrayed a divine trust. Mussulmans will never acquiesce in any arrangement that permitted any form of control being exercised by a non-Moslem Power over any part of the Jazirat-ul-Arab.

Then there is a series of religious injunctions with regard to the Holy Places. The three Sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem must

always be in the custody and under the wardenship of the Khalifa, and the wardenship of no one also could satisfy the conscience of Mussulmans. Mussulmans also claim that the Shrines of Najaf, Karbala, Kazimain, Samarra, and Baghdad should remain under his wardenship. Non-Moslem control over the territory in which they are situated is not at all permissible.

If I may now reverse the order in which I have outlined the three-fold claim of the Mussulmans, I will say that the three Sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines I have named in Mesopotamia, must continue to remain under the wardenship of the Khalifa precisely as they did before the war. They are all situated within the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and there must be exclusive Moslem control over every part of that region. Now, if that control is the Khalifa's control as before the war, not only will this religious requirement be fulfilled, but it will also assist in the fulfilment of the first religious requirement to which I have referred namely, the preservation of the Khilafat with temporal power adequate for purposes of the defence of our faith. Therefore, if, on the one hand, the pledge of the Prime Minister of 5 January 1918, the solemnity of which he has now fully proclaimed, is redeemed in its entirety, and the twelfth point of President Wilson's fourteen points, on the basis of which Armistice was concluded with Turkey, is honoured in the observance, and, on the other hand, the religious requirements imposed on the Mussulmans by their faith with regard to the Jazirat-ul Arab and the Holy Places are respected, as we claim they should be respected as the basis of our loyalty, then the main requirement of the preservation of the Khilafat will be fulfilled, and the territorial *status quo ante bellum* would be restored. This Delegation will be satisfied if the Khilafat is thus preserved with sufficient territory and temporal power, and, if necessary, guarantees may be taken for good government, security of life, religious toleration, and opportunities of autonomous development of the subject races, consistently with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign.

I would mention here that, while we recognise that it is the bounden duty of their subjects to maintain their allegiance to the Allied and Associated Government, we desire to say that all Mussulmans are bound at the same time to maintain their allegiance to the Khilafat, and ask you to recognise that we have our religious as well as our political obligations. We do not desire, for is it possible for us to move away from the political position in which we stand, just as we do not desire that our position should be made embarrassing by any ill-considered action of these Governments with regard to the Khalifa's Government. If demands were made which we could not satisfy without prejudice to our salvation, we would have to consider the whole position in that case.

As regards the propaganda carried on in this country against the Turks, we feel that, when the Turks are accused of crimes against humanity, these accusations are due in a great measure to religious and racial prejudices ingrained for centuries past in the communities indulge in these accusations,

and in no inconsiderable measure also to the greed and covetousness of Turkey's neighbours that have for long wanted to grab as much as they could of Ottoman territories. To say the very least of it, these crimes have been much exaggerated. In some parts of the Christian world it is considered that the Turks should be driven out of Constantinople not only because they are Turks and guilty of criminal conduct, but because they are Moslem, and Islam itself is a blight. We have to remove that these deeply rooted prejudices and repudiate the association of criminal conduct with Islam. But at the same time we are also anxious to exert our influence as Mussulmans so that not only such things, but even the suspicion of such things, should not be possible in future. As regards the character of the Turks, we think it very different indeed from what it has so often been described to be. We should not like to say anything at all about the character of the propaganda of the Churches among other sources of mischief and prejudice. We are not here to increase any kind of bitterness, as a matter of fact, we have come on a mission of peace. But this much we will say, that before one can judge the Turks impartially, one has to enquire into the intrigues carried on for two centuries at least by the enemies of Turkey to foment trouble among her Christian subjects, and thereby make out a plausible case for lopping off parts of the Ottoman Empire in Europe and Asia. One will also have to enquire into the character of the dealings of these Christian populations of Turkey with their Moslem neighbours, and ascertain whether these dealings were neighbourly or provocative. In any case, we think that even if the Turks have been to a certain extent to blame, it must be admitted that they have had a very great lesson, and I can assure you, Sir, that Indian Mussulmans do not think that they have nothing more to do if their claims are satisfied; if a settlement is made such as they hope for, they would endeavour to create a desire in the Turks for reconciliation with the British Government and their Allies. They would also impress upon the Turks that not only must such atrocities as they are so recklessly accused of not occur, but they must also be above the suspicion of committing such atrocities. As Mussulmans we have to wipe off the stain of inhumanity from the fair name of Islam, and the British Government and their Allies can rest assured that Indian Mussulmans will not fail in their duty towards Islam in a matter of this kind. Their restraining influence would be utilised to the fullest extent. Our Mission is of a double character. It is our duty to represent matters to His Majesty's Government, because we are his subjects; and it is our duty to represent matters to the Khalifa, who is the Commander of the Faithful. Both these duties we should like to observe. If a settlement such as we desire is made with the Khilafat, our influence for the good would naturally greatly increase, and it would be used in the interests of the Empire and of humanity. But if the settlement goes against our sentiments and religious obligations, without saying one word which may be likely to be misconstrued into a threat, we must frankly state that we shall have to think of our religious duty first.

I should like to say that it is very difficult for His Majesty's Government, removed as it is, both in point of distance and religious and political surroundings, from India, to understand what is actually happening there. I do not like to say anything against the Government of India or the officials there if I can help it. They have been exceedingly courteous in receiving our Deputation and facilitating our departure from India and our coming over here. But I must say that the official world does not fully understand what is passing in the hearts of the people of the country. At any rate, I think we are in a better position to understand how things stand with our people. A considerable portion of my life has been more or less a blank lately owing to internment and incarceration. I assure you, Sir, it was only when we came out of the prison and saw things with our own eyes that we discovered—and it was a great shock to us—what the real state of the country was at the time of our release. India has changed so enormously that anyone who knew it five years ago would not recognise it to-day. It has changed so rapidly, in fact, that it is no longer a question of years but of months. Well, the officials in India at any rate do understand better than most people here that if in the settlement with Turkey regard is not had for the religious obligations and the position of the Mussulmans, it will be a very serious matter indeed. I am not an Englishman, and cannot pretend to know the English language as well as Englishmen themselves know it, and I fear that words that I may use may sometimes bear a significance that I may not have intended. It is difficult for me to explain, but I will say this. I heard in the House of Commons soon after we came over to London and went to hear the debate on Constantinople, Colonel Wedgwood say : 'You can get a great deal out of Englishmen by persuading them, but you must not use threats.' Well, Sir, I suppose that is true of every self-respecting people, and since it is true of Englishmen also, I will beg of any Englishman, I will beg of Colonel Wedgwood, and I will beg of you, Sir, to tell me how to frame a warning, that would be the most serious of warnings, but would not be construed into a threat.

Finally, I may add that in some quarters hostile to Turkey, and even to India, efforts are being made to belittle the importance of the mission which has brought us here, and it is said that the Indian Khilafat Delegation is unimpressive. With reference to this, all that I can say is that we could have brought a larger body of men with us, and also people more distinguished than ourselves. But it must be understood that work has to be done in India also, and we cannot spare many men for the work here; and it ought to be understood that we do represent the entire body of Mussulmans of India, and the vast bulk of our Hindu compatriots and others who are in this matter at one with us.

Mr. Syud Hossain : I should like to supplement what has been said by one or two observations. The question has been raised, both in the Press here and in India, that in this matter Mahommedan agitators are trying to make political capital, and that there is no foundation of any religious feeling

in it. I should like to say that this is utterly untrue. In this matter, at any rate, it is our duty to inform His Majesty's Government that it is not really a political question so far as we are concerned. It is purely a religious question. I should like to say this in support that Turkey has been at war with the various European nations for the last 300 years. Sometimes she has fought with the active support of England. Sometimes she has won, sometimes lost. We Mahommedans in India never raised the question of the Khilafat at all. This is the first time in the history of British rule in India that the question has arisen, and it has been raised now because the Khilafat has been put in jeopardy. That is the important feature. It is in jeopardy for this reason. As the result of this last war the territories of the Ottoman Empire, including those regions regarded as sacred, are being brought into the melting pot. The impression in India is that some of these territories are about to be annexed by Great Britain herself, and I can assure you that this possibility has created a very great deal of anxiety and alarm and very genuine feelings which are not pleasant, because, as the Mahommedans view it, up to now strict religious neutrality has been the foundation of British rule in India; and certainly the loyalty of the Indian Mahommedans which has been a tradition of English rule, has been largely built up by the fact that so far as their religious life was concerned, they enjoyed a very uncommon degree of freedom and security. But now the situation is that apparently Great Britain herself is going to be a party to the dismemberment not only of the Turkish Empire, but to the dismemberment of the actual realm of the Khilafat. This area, according to Islamic law, has got to be under the guardianship of the Khalifa and nobody else. If by any direction of the British Empire this region is given to any non-Islamic power, the Indian Mahommedan has got to choose between his loyalty to the British Crown and his spiritual allegiance to the Khalifa. It is a choice which he would prefer to avoid. I mention this point to make it clear that this is not a political question. It is a religious question.

Then I would say this. The question has also been raised in more than one quarter that the Hindus in India have got nothing on earth to do with the Khilafat question, and that the fact that they are making common cause with the Mahommedans in itself argues that this is a political movement rather than a religious question. As to that, I would say that if you were aware of recent facts in Indian national life you would at once see that this is not the case. During the last few months, certainly during the last year, there has been a very extraordinary fusion of Hindu and Mahommedan feeling in India, and the reason why the Hindus have come into this movement is because from the Indian point of view they have come to regard the Khilafat issue as a national rather than a sectarian question. They have taken this view chiefly on account of Mr. Gandhi.

Mr. Gandhi has laid down the principle that in as much as the chief thing we are out to have is Indian national unity; if it is the case that so many crores

of Indian Mahommedans feel that this is a matter of life and death to them, then the Hindu, consistently with the idea of national unity, cannot stand aside. Mr. Gandhi has said they must make common cause with their Mahommedan compatriots exactly as he would expect us to make common cause with the Hindus if the Hindus were up against similar difficulties. That is why there has been nothing of a hole-and-corner nature in this matter. They have all come in with a clear recognition of this point that in so far as they desire to have a common Indian nation and we form a great part of that nation, what affects us so closely must be a matter which concerns the Hindus also. This is an All-India question. They are just as committed to our cause as we are ourselves.

The All-India Khilafat Conference formally adopted a Manifesto which is really the mandate of the Delegation which we comprise, and in this document, which I would ask your permission to quote, is set forth very briefly the whole of our position.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I might mention that before drawing this up, in which Mr. Gandhi took a considerable share, he desired to have before him Mahommedan experts. He had them and he cross-examined them at great length and in great detail, and entirely satisfied himself that these were our religious obligations.

Mr. Syud Hossain : The Manifesto says that the claim on behalf of the Mahommedans of India in connection with the Turkish peace term may be divided into two sections :

1. Regarding the Khilafat.
2. Regarding what is called 'Jazirat-ul-Arab,' and the Holy Places of Islam.

The claim regarding the Khilafat consists in leaving the Turkish Empire as it was at the time of the war, with such guarantees being taken by the League of Nations as may be necessary for the due protection of the rights of non-Muslim or non-Turkish races living within the Turkish Empire, consistently with its dignity as a Sovereign State.

The second claim consists in the sovereignty over the 'Jazirat-ul-Arab' *i.e.*, Arabia as defined by Muslim religious authorities and the custody of the Holy Places of Islam.

Arabia as thus defined is bounded by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, the Euphrates, and the Tigris. The Holy Places include the three Sacred Harams namely, Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem; and the Holy Shrines namely, Najaf, Karbala, Samarra, Kazimain, and Baghdad.

In reality this claim is included in the first, but it is distinguishable from it in that the custody of the Holy Places has ever since the establishment of Islam been under the Khilafat, and unlike the boundary of the latter, which has fluctuated from time to time, has never suffered any diminution whatsoever. This claim does not exclude genuine Arab Self-Government, but it does

exclude the present arrangement, because those who know understand the unreality behind it. The claim now said to be made by Sharif Hussain and by Amir Feisul is inconsistent, in fact, with their acceptance of even the Spiritual Sovereignty of the Khilafat.

The claim is primarily based upon the religious requirements and the sentiments of the Mahommedans of India in common with those of Mahommedans all the world over, and is supported by, so far as the Khilafat, the Harams, and the Jazirat-ul-Arab are concerned, testimony from the Quran or from the traditions of the Prophet, and, for the rest, by other religious authority. It is further supported regarding the Holy Places by the deliberate declaration of the Government of India, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, as also the Governments of France and Rüssia, of November 2, 1914.

I need not read the citations. They include Mr. Llyod George's pledge of January 5, 1918, and President Wilson's twelfth point.

The Manifesto concludes thus :

'It is necessary to state the likely consequences of a wrong decision on the part of the Imperial Government or the Allied and Associated Powers. The claim is supported by practically the whole of the Hindu population in India. It has assumed, therefore, an Indian national status. The policy of the British Government has been definitely stated to be that of making India an equal partner. Recent events have awakened India to a sense of her dignity. In these circumstances. the British Empire, as one consisting of free nationalities, can only hold together by maintaining an attitude of absolute impartiality among the three chief communities—the Hindus, the Mahommedans, and the Christians. It is therefore urged that the British Ministers are bound not merely to press the Mahommedan, or rather the Indian, claim before the Supreme Council, but to make it their own. If, however, for any reason whatever they fail to do so, and the Supreme Council also fails to perform its elementary duty of giving effect to the declarations that brought about an Armistice, it is futile to expect peace in India, and the Khilafat Conference will fail in its duty if it hesitated to warn His Majesty's Ministers that an affront put upon the seven crores of Mahommedans in India supported by the twenty-three crores of Hindus and others, will be incompatible with the expectation of blind loyalty. Beyond that it is impossible for the Conference to foresee the results. It may be added that even if the members of the Conference attempted seriously to pacify the Mahommedan mind, it is futile to expect that they would succeed in healing the wound that would be made in the heart of Mahommedan India by the denial of justice and breach of pledges in a matter of vital importance to that community.'

Sir William Duke : I do not quite follow the bearing on the Sacred Places of Jazirat-ul-Arab; I understand that the principal Holy Places in Mesopotamia are only places of pilgrimage for the Shiahs who do not recognise the Khalifa.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : The Holy Places are held in very great reverence and by all sects; many Sunni Mahommedans also visit the Shrines.

Sir William Duke : The bulk of the pilgrims are Shiahs. It is not in the same way a necessary pilgrimage to the Sunnis.

Mr. Fisher : You have come a very long journey to put your case before the British Government, and although you apologised for your English, I may say that there is very little need for any apology. You put your case very fully and very clearly and, if I may say so, very temperately before us. The British Government is, of course, well aware that it had the valuable assistance of a million Indian soldiers in the recent war, and that many of those soldiers were Moslems by religion, and it is aware of its obligations not only to the Moslem soldiers who fought for it in the war, but to all its loyal Moslem subjects in India; and I think you may feel assured that we are anxious to study the religious susceptibilities and sympathies of your fellow-believers, and that whatever conclusions may be reached in respect of the international settlements, the settlement of the world's affairs, attention to the Indian aspect of the case will always be given. Indeed, it is no secret that the decision which has recently been taken by the Allied and Associated Powers to retain Turkish sovereignty in Constantinople has been to a large extent influenced by the desire of the British Government to meet the religious feelings of its Moslem subjects in India. Still, of course, you will realise that, while that is an important factor, and a factor which the British Government will never lose sight of, it is not the sole factor which the Ministers responsible to the British Government have to take into account in these far-reaching and complex transactions. There are other factors as well. Of course, as you, I think, are perfectly well aware, consideration for the position of the subject peoples of the Turkish Empire is one of the elements which has to be taken into account, and I feel that I ought to remind you of the fact that a very painful impression has been created in this country by the news of the recent massacres in Cilicia. I wish to point out to you that the issue is a complex one; but one to the solution of which the British Government brings very steadfast good-will to the Moslem population of India, and you may be assured that what you have said will be duly considered by the Government.

Mr. Mohamed Ali, you have been very careful to avoid anything in the nature of the language of threats, and you have been wise in doing so. Of course, as you realise perfectly well from your large experience of public affairs, the British Government is bound to frame its views on wide considerations of policy, and cannot be deflected one inch from its course by anything in the nature of threats. But at the same time the British Government is bound to give due consideration to any views which may be sincerely felt and honestly expressed by loyal subjects of the Empire.

I very much regret that the Secretary of State has not been able to receive this deputation. He desired to do so. He is disappointed that he is unable to meet you; but, as you are aware, he is unwell at the present

moment and consequently I am taking his place. I hope, however, that before you return to India you may have an opportunity of meeting the Prime Minister and of laying your views before him. As you know, a Conference is taking place at the present time. The Prime Minister is meeting the statesman of the Allied countries in Downing Street, and many important issues are being discussed. Mr. Llyod George's time is very much occupied, and I cannot promise you that he will be able to see you, but I hope that he may be able to do so.

Gentlemen, I have only one other thing to say, and it is this. As a philosopher once said, history is always a *pis aller*, a choice of second best. It is founded on compromise. We cannot all get everything that we want, but you may be quite certain that the British Government will never fail in giving due consideration to feelings of loyalty and sincerity expressed by subjects of the Empire.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : May I express the thanks of the Delegation for the reception that you have so cordially given to us : I quite understand, I think all of us understand, even the most illiterate in India, that our desires and sentiments cannot be the sole factor in a settlement of this kind. But there is one joint that has not been entirely appreciated that we particularly desire to lay stress upon, namely, that there are certain religious obligations that are of such a binding character that they must be our first consideration; and since our loyalty is based on respect for our religious obligations, regard for them must be the first consideration of His Majesty's Government also. It is true that life is one long second best, and that compromise is of the very essence of politics It is precisely because we recognise this that we have not asked for any thing more than the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*. But if a new earth and a new heaven were to be created, as we were at one time led to hope from the utterances of the statesmen of Allied and Associated Nations, and if, therefore, all the territories taken and retained by force were to be restored to their rightful owners, then we would have asked for the return of Egypt, of Tripoli, of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of Crete, and of the large slices of Turkish territory carved out by the Balkan Allies. But we have not done that, though we are in full sympathy with the just demands of our co-religionists there. It is therefore quite clear that we have already applied the maxim of *pis aller* in the region in which it can be applied. But in the domain of faith and religious obligations there can be no compromises. That we can only have the best, and the best is just good enough. There the second best is just as bad as the very worst.

With regard to our desire for interview with the Prime Minister, we recognise his position, and understand how difficult it must be for him to find time. But, if I may say so, without disrespect, if Mr. Venizelos can come so often and have the ear of His Majesty's Government, it will only seem right that representatives of Indian Mussulmans and Indians generally, who, as you have acknowledged, Sir, have come here from a long distance, should be given

a fair hearing and enabled to put their case before His Majesty's Ministers before decisions are taken.

As regards the 'Cilician massacres', we believe that the news that has come over here is from very tainted sources. So far as we are concerned, we should like a thorough and impartial enquiry into the whole question of these so-called massacres, and we would court the utmost publicity for the investigation into the offences alleged against the Turks and its results. Let there be a Commission sent out to examine the facts and the causes that have brought about a state of affairs that all alike must deplore. So far Greeks and Jews and Armenians all have been sending all sorts of roving Commissions, and it is the Indian Mussulmans alone that have been kept out. They could therefore well ask for a Commission of their own being permitted to enquire into these massacres. But, to permit no possibility of a suspicion of partiality, we say that English people as well as Indians should be represented on this Commission. Not the highest among us would consider such a task beneath him, and even His Exalted Highness the Nizam and other Indian rulers, Ulema like Maulana Abdul Bari and Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan, and leaders of Indian public opinion, both Hindu and Moslem, would gladly welcome such an opportunity to sift the truth. Let there be a thorough investigation. If the Turk be as he is said to be, we will wash our hands off him. We do not wish Islam to be regarded as the supporter of murderers.

There is one thing more that I must ask your permission to refer to. There have been certain statements in the speeches, both of the Prime Minister and of the Leader of the House of Commons, with reference to the Khalifa, the seat of the Khilafat and the Allies, garrisoning of the Straits. We think we can understand that the exigencies of Parliamentary debates, and politics generally, sometimes drive politicians to attempt to reconcile opposite points of view and satisfy all parties, and to express opinions in a language which they would have preferred not to use, and would not have used in the intimacy of private discussions. But if it is really to be the case that the Khalifa is to be kept at Constantinople under the guns of the Allied Powers; and is to exist in constant fear even of his own life, his position would be worse than that of the Pope at the Vatican. He would be the Pope at Avignon, and even worse than that, for he would be a prisoner of people of alien faith and race. If that is to be the case, we would far rather see him in exile at Broussa, or even Koniah, than in such a plight. The consequences of such an affront to Islam cannot be exaggerated and cannot wisely be underrated.

Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi : I should just like to add that I am perhaps the first Indian 'Maulvi' that has come over to this country. I am not a politician, nor is Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, of the famous family of the Ulema of Ferangi Mahal, Lucknow, who has particularly asked me to

represent him. This ought to convince His Majesty's Government that this is not a political matter to us, but a religious matter.

Source: The Muslim Outlook, March, 1920.

58

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

3 March 1920

My attention has just been drawn to the speech of Lord Bryce to the Armenian Society on Thursday night at Caxton Hall; and although I am extremely averse to engage in a controversy when passions are running so high, I cannot allow one statement to pass unchallenged and uncontradicted. Among other inflammatory remarks, he is reported to have said that the Mahommedans of India had not uttered a word of condemnation regarding the 'massacres in Cilicia'. The statement is misleading and reprehensibly inexact. The Mahommedans of India are as horrified at the reports as anyone else here or elsewhere, and they hold that, if there has been deliberate butchery of innocent people, no punishment can be too severe for the culprits. But they demand that there should be an impartial investigation by an impartial Allied Commission into these horrors, and its report should be published so that they, along with their British fellow-subjects, may know the true facts from the beginning. Europe, they say, has drawn a veil over the cruelties practised against their fellow-Muslims in Armenia and Western Asia Minor, and they will not be satisfied until and unless the guilt has been established impartially on whichever side the guilt may lie.

Lord Bryce is reported to have also said that the Indian Mahommedans have been pleading for Turkey. He evidently does not realise that they plead for peace within the British Empire, which does not appear to appeal to Lord Bryce and his colleagues.

The fact is that the Mussulmans are convinced that the story of all the massacre is a downright foul lie. At all times the Christians began the massacre of Mussulmans.

Source: The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

59

LETTER FROM THE MEMBERS OF KHILAFAT DELEGATION TO THE EDITOR OF DAILY HERALD

9 March 1920

Will you allow us, on behalf of the Mussulmans of India, to make a suggestion in your columns ? It is that an impartial Commission of Inquiry should proceed to investigate the whole question of responsibility as between Muslims and Armenians on the spot, even at this eleventh hour; and that representatives selected by the All-India Muslim League should form part of such a Commission. This would satisfy the Mussulmans, who have been amazed that no investigation into these occurences has yet been held. The only investigation of which they have heard has been that of the Armenian reports by professed partisans of the Armenians for a merely propagandist purpose. Since the Armistice a number of reports, categorical and apparently well-authenticated, of atrocities committed by Armenians have been published showing that there is at least a case for the defence. It is not in accordance with the principles of justice to pronounce a verdict on the case for the prosecution alone.

On the Commission should be men acquainted with the laws of war and men acquainted with the peoples and languages of Anatolia. Special attention should be paid to the Russian intrigues with the Armenians and the Kurds, which were engineered from the Tiflis previous to the war, and the events which took place in the vilayets of Van, Bitlis, and Erzeroum in February–March, 1915. The fact that no impartial international inquiry has been held into these matters since the Armistice with Turkey has caused a painful impression in India. That and the withholding of the report of the Inter-Allied Commission of Inquiry into the events which accompanied the Greek occupation of Smyrna made Indian Mussulmans regard the Turks as victims of injustice. Let them not think there is no justice for the Muslim at the hands of Christian Powers. They cannot be expected to repose confidence in, and accept the verdict of, purely Christian investigators. That is why we suggest that a certain number of Indian Muslims should be included in a Commission of Inquiry into the Armenian question, so that they should see for themselves that all is open and above-board.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

60

LETTER FROM SYED SULAIMAN NADVI TO THE EDITOR OF THE MUSLIM OUTLOOK

I was surprised to read in a recent issue of the 'Morning Post' under the heading 'The Sultan as Caliph', excerpts from a pamphlet entitled 'The Nature of the Caliphate', purporting to have emanated from the pen of Professor Nallino, of the University of Rome, and published by the Italian Foreign Office. Professor Nallino is an Orientalist of some repute and occupies the chair of the History and Institutions of Islam. It is, therefore, all the more regrettable that a scholar of such repute should betray such profound ignorance on a subject which is his special study, nor does it reflect much credit on the Italian Foreign Office to have published the pamphlet under the authority of the State when better and more reliable sources of information were available to it.

No contention could be farther from fact than Professor Nallino's thesis that 'Sunnite Islamism has never admitted a supreme head of the Islamic Church.' This is against recorded history, and I would refer the Professor to the chapters on *Imamate* in books on the Islamic articles of faith to revise his views on the point. The only difference between the Shiahs and the Sunnis on this question is that, while the Shiahs consider descent from the Prophet essential for any valid claim to *Imamate*, the Sunnis do not subscribe to this view. But both equally believe in and admit a supreme head of the Islamic Church. Allama Nasfi, Imam Razi, Qazi Uzud, among other eminent authorities, deal with the subjects exhaustively in their books and should be considered final authorities on the point. An authentic tradition of the Prophet in *Sahih Muslim* explicitly declares that if a Mussulman dies without acknowledging the Imam of his time he dies the death of a kafir (infidel). Can the eminent Professor seriously maintain his thesis in the face of this explicit and authoritative declaration of the holy Prophet and advise the Mussulmans to live a kafir's life and die a kafir's death ? It is true that, unlike the Catholics and the Shiahs, the Sunnis do not attribute infallibility to their Imam, but there is a world of difference between this and the contention that 'Sunnite Islamism has never admitted a supreme head of the Church.'

Equally untenable and contrary to facts is the contention that 'the Caliphate died out definitively in A.D. 1258, when the Tartars sacked Baghdad putting an end to the Caliphate of the Abbasides.' It is true that it ceased to exist as the centre of the Khilafat after its sack in 1258, but the Khilafat itself continued, only it shifted to a new centre in Egypt, where it wielded power until the conquest of the country by the Turks. If Professor Nallino takes the trouble of reading Jalaluddin Suyuti's authoritative and easily

accessible book, '*History of the Caliphs*, he will find a faithfully and connected record of the events of the reigns of every Khalifa down to the time of the author Abbasi, himself. The last Khalifa of this line was Mohammad Abbasi, who took his abode in Constantinople (A.H.918) in A.D. 1518, when Egypt passed into the hands of the Ottoman Sultan Selim, to whom he handed all the symbols of Khilafat and the sacred relics. After this Sultan Selim was raised to the dignity of the Khalifa without opposition from any part of the Muslim world. Since then on even Friday the names of the Sultans of Turkey are most reverently read from every mosque and pulpit in the Islamic world to the faithful assembled for Friday prayers.

If Professor Nallino goes to India and visits any mosque, right from the grand mosque of the metropolis of the Indian Empire down to the humblest mosque in the most obscure corner of that vast country, he can verify the statement for himself. The practice is not confined to India alone. What is true of India is true of the whole Muslim world. On its way to England our delegation had occasion to witness the intensity of Muslim feeling on the point in the Italian colony of Eritrea. When our ship touched at Mossowa and local Mussulmans, including Government and police officers, under the very eyes of their superiors, immediately on the knowledge of the mission on which we were coming, spontaneously burst into a rousing prayer for the success of the delegation and the preservation and victory of the Sultan-Khalifa. Surely this should be sufficient to soothe the Professor's scepticism.

Works of Muslim authors and the question of Muslim practice apart, the Professor would not have fallen into the error of terminating the Khilafat in A.D. 1258, had he taken the trouble even to consult the work of a Christian author. I refer to the '*Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*', by Edward Thomas. He will there find that not only till A.D. 1258, but even as far as A.D. 1530, all the coins of the Mussulman kings of India bore the name and title of the Khalifa in acknowledgment of his overlordship of Islam. The fact is that, not only did Muslims acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Khalifa, but no Muslim ruler, as a rule, had any pretentions to anything higher than power vicariously exercised on behalf of the Khalifa. If the practice suffered a temporary eclipse in India during the reign of Akbar, the reason is obvious. It was because Akbar had the ambition to storm the sacred precincts of Almighty God Himself and to arrogate to himself the attribute of divinity. And this is responsible for the disapprobation of the Mussulmans of India which he incurred, in spite of the many undoubted blessings which his rule conferred on India.

More recent and crucial instances in which the authority of the Khalifas, as recognised heads of the Islamic polity and—what is still more significant—the authority of the Sultans of Turkey as Khalifas, was recognised are the wars of the East India Company against Sultan Tippu and the mutiny of 1857. A reference to the records of the time shows that not only did the Mussulmans recognise the Ottoman Sultan as Khalifa, but the British themselves

recognised the fact and tried to mobilise the Khalifa's powers for their own benefit. In this connection a reference to the *Karnamai Hydari*, a work quoted also in the monograph on Cornwallis in the Rulers of India series.

But it is not, I believe, that the Professor has not come across these historical facts, for he does refer to some of them. Only he designates them as 'deliberate tricks' and 'mistakes'. My reply to that is that if they are deliberate tricks and mistakes, they are tricks and mistakes which the Mussulmans have consistently and without interruption perpetrated throughout their long history of thirteen hundred years and more. And, after all, they should be the final authority on matter concerning their religion.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

61

SYED HUSAIN ON TURKEY, INDIAN MUSLIMS AND THE KHILAFAT

The Indian Khalifat Delegation, which arrived in London last week, and which was received by the Right Hon. H.A.L. Fisher on behalf of the Secretary of State for India on Tuesday last, is charged with a mission whose aims and object, it is important, should be made known to and clearly realised by the people of the United Kingdom. In due course we hope to put our case before the Prime Minister himself and the Peace Conference, but it is not less essential that it should also be placed, fully and frankly, before the British public and Parliament.

The issue which has brought us to this country is a grave one, but before I refer to it, it may be useful to add a word in regard to our credentials. The Delegation has been sent by the All-India Khalifat Conference, probably the most representative body of its kind that has ever been constituted in India to deal with a public question. It includes not only the leading Mussulmans of India, irrespective of party and sect, but the foremost leaders of the Hindu community as well, such as M. K. Gandhi, the Hon Pandit M. M. Malaviya, the Hon. Pandit Motilal Nehru, President of the Indian National Congress, and Mr. B. G. Tilak a remarkable manifestation of the solidarity of Hindu-Muslim unity which has been achieved in recent years. The Khilafat question, therefore, is not merely a Muslim, but an Indian question, and the Hindus have identified themselves with the Muslim cause because they realise that it is a matter of life and death to the seventy millions of their Muslim compatriots.

KHALIFA AS TEMPORAL POWER

The Mussulmans of India are primarily interested in the Turkish settle-

ment because the Sultan of Turkey is the Khalifa of Islam and the warden of its Holy Shrines. It is of the essence of the institution of the Khilafat - whose history is co-extensive with the history of Islam - that the Khalifa should be an independent temporal sovereign before he can be the spiritual head of the Muslim world. Amir-ul-Momenin (Commander of the Faithful - is the formal designation the Khalifa, and the role postulates the capacity and strength to be a Defender of the Faith. This qualification, it should be noted, is not a matter of sentiment or theory, but an indefensible obligation imposed by solemn religious injunction It follows, therefore, that a dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa involves the disintegration of the Khilafat: the Sultan of Turkey cannot be both a temporal figurehead and Khalifa of Islam What the Muslim world desires, therefore, is that the fabric of the Ottoman Empire, of the Khilafat shall be maintained intact, on the basis of the territorial, though not necessarily the political, *status quo ante bellum* This means that while there is not the slightest objection to any homogeneous community, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, which forms part of the Turkish Empire, being assured, in the words of President Wilson, 'an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development', the principle of self-determination should be worked out within a scheme of Ottoman Empire.

SOLEMN PLEDGES

We believe this can be done if a bonafide attempt is made to apply the principles set forth in President Wilson's twelfth point, on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was signed, and the pledges given to the Muslim world by Mr. Lloyd George in his speech of January 5, 1918, when he declared, as he himself claimed, 'not merely the mind of the Government, but of the nation and the Empire as a whole.' I would ask my readers to refer to the terms of these two pronouncements; the Muslim case is nothing more, and nothing less, than a demand for the fulfilment of the solemn pledges contained therein and in proclamation issued by Lord Hardinge as Viceroy of India - pledges which induced tens of thousands of Indian Mussulmans to give their lives in the late war in defence of England and the Empire. If the pledges to which I refer are now redeemed, in the spirit in which they were given and accepted, the inviolability of Jazirat-ul-Arab -- the 'Island of Arabia' as delimited by Muslim religious authorities, in which are situated the cities and the shrines consecrated by the imperishable religious traditions and historical associations of the Mussulmans, and which have never been in other than Muslim control during the 1,400 years of Islamic history would be secured. That is a cardinal requirement of Islamic religious existence, which no Muslim, consistently with the obligations of his faith, may surrender or minimise.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

62

MEMORANDUM ADDRESSED TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND BY MOHAMED ALI, SYED HUSAIN AND SYED SULAIMAN NADWI, MEMBERS OF THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION

In view of the frantic efforts still being made in certain quarters to force the hands of His Majesty's Government and of the Supreme Council by publishing reports of massacres alleged to have been perpetrated by the Turks and thereby to induce the Allies against their better judgment to go back on the most categorical pledges so solemnly and repeatedly given, the Indian Khilafat Delegation deem it their duty to invite the attention of His Majesty's Government and of the Supreme Council to a suggestion they have made that a competent and impartial Commission of Inquiry, including representatives of the All India Khilafat Conference, should be sent out to investigate the entire series of allegations with regard to the so-called massacres, and where any loss of life may in fact have taken place to inquire into their causes and extent, the provocation offered to the alleged aggressors, and the character of the forces engaged on both sides. It is a source of gratification to the Delegation that the Turks themselves have asked the United States to send out a Commission impartially to investigate the alleged Marash massacres and conditions generally in Anatolia.

Since it is on the assumption that the Turks have treated their unoffending Christian fellow-subjects inhumanly that so many arguments for their expulsion from Europe are being based, the Indian Khilafat Delegation must emphatically challenge that assumption and ask for a thorough and impartial investigation, in which they respectively urge that the All India Khilafat Conference, the most comprehensive body in India of recent times, be adequately represented. To Mussulmans and Oriental people generally their good name is of far greater value than mere strips of territory, and when accusations continue to be made so recklessly these people cannot be denied an impartial tribunal such as they demand without exposing the utter hollowness of such accusation.

DANGER OF MILITARY OCCUPATION

Further, the Delegation desire to say that they are deeply concerned to read in the Press rumours of a contemplated occupation of the seat of the Khilafat by British military and naval forces, and they would fail in their duty if they did not convey a respectful warning to His Majesty's Government of the extreme seriousness of the probable consequences of such highly ill-advised and provocative action. The Delegation would add that in view of the

disturbed and excited condition of Muslim feelings, consequent upon the threats of the Turks, expulsion from Europe and dismemberment even of the Asiatic Empire of the Khilafat, it would not be surprising if some regrettable incidents occur on insidious provocation being offered, and the Delegation would suggest that the time is opportune for impressive assurances being given on behalf of His Majesty's Government and the Supreme Council that no political or religious prejudices will be allowed to influence an equitable settlement with the Turkey, and that the Treaty of Peace will be based on a desire for reconciliation rather than revenge.

Such assurances cannot fail to allay the misgivings in the Muslim mind, as well as ease the general situation in the Turkish Empire. The Delegation have been constrained to address this representation to you in view of the grave emergency that has arisen. They however hope to discuss the various questions involved in the Turkish settlement in greater detail in an early interview promised to them on your behalf by the Right Hon. the President of the Board of Education.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

63

LETTER FROM MAHOMED ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'MANCHESTER GUARDIAN'

14 March 1920

The members of the Indian Caliphate Delegation have read with great interest Mr. Arnold Toynbee's letter in your issue of the 12th. Without entering here into any controversial matters arising out of his letter, may I say that my colleagues and I welcome Mr. Toynbee's suggestion of a personal discussion with him regarding what he is good enough to describe as our 'very helpful proposal' for the appointment of an impartial Commission, on which Indian Muslims would be represented, and we are taking steps to bring about a meeting with him with a view to such a discussion.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

64

TELEGRAM FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION TO LLOYD GEORGE AND THE CHIEF MINISTERS OF OTHER STATES

The Indian Khilafat Delegation have learned with profound distress of the forcible Allied occupation of the seat of the Khilafat and the use of Muslim troops against Commander of the Faithful. The Delegation entertain the gravest misgiving that the mission of peace and reconciliation on which they have come here on behalf of the people of India will be frustrated if a policy so aggressive and humiliating to Islam is pursued. The Delegation urge that protection of Christian population in Asia Minor does not necessitate or justify an affront to the conscience of Islam, which they can state with the utmost assurance will have the most unfortunate effect possible upon feeling in India, already so gravely exasperated by suggestions of dismemberment of the Khilafat.

The Delegation earnestly appeal to the Allied Powers to refrain from a policy which they feel will fail to achieve the object in view, and will produce the most unfortunate consequences in India.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, March 1920.

65

THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION : OFFICIAL INTERVIEW WITH THE PRIME MINISTER

PRESENT :

Right Hon. David Llyod George.	Mr. Syed Hossain.
Right Hon. H. A. I. Fisher.	Maulana Syud Sulaiman Nadvi.
Sir Frederick William Duke.	Mr. H. M. Hayat.
Mr. Mohamed Ali.	

The Prime Minister : Now, Mr. Mohamed Ali, will you state your case?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I have just noted down a few points which, if you will permit me, I will amplify as I proceed, so that you will have a fair record of what we desire to present. First of all, with regard to our credentials. I suppose it is not necessary for me to go into that matter ?

The Prime Minster : No, I know exactly who you are and whom you represent.

Mr. Mohamed 'Ali : I only want to make it clear that we have come here chiefly in connection with a religious question, which is of the greatest importance to us. With regard to this, we desire to point out what is the connection of Indian Mussulmans with the Khilafat. Islam, as we understand it, is not a set of doctrines and dogmas; it is a complete outlook on life, a moral code and a social polity. It recognises no lacerating and devitalising distinctions between things spiritual and things temporal, between Church and State. It looks upon life as one indivisible synthesis, and it purports to provide divine guidence for all the affairs of mankind. Muslims regard themselves as servants of God, owing allegiance to Him in the first place, and acknowledging his authority alone in the last resort. Islam recognises no ethnical, geographical or political barriers to free human intercourse and sympathy. Islam's whole outlook on life is supernational rather than national. Islam has always had two centres, the first a personal one and the other a local one. The personal centre is the Caliph, or the Khalifa, as we call him, the successor of the Prophet. Because the Prophet was the personal centre of Islam, his successors, or Khalifas, continue his tradition to this day. The local centre is the region known as the Jazirat-ul-Arab, or the 'Island of Arabia', the 'Land of the Prophets'. To Islam, Arabia has been not a peninsula but an island, the fourth boundary being the waters of Euphrates and the Tigris. The Khalifa is the Commander of the Faithful in all matters for which Islam provides Divine guidance, and his orders are to be obeyed by all Mussulmans as long as they do not conflict with the Commandments of God and the Traditions of the Prophet.

For the defence of the Faith, the Commander of the Faithful must always retain adequate territories, naval and military forces, and financial resources, all of which can be summed up in the expression 'temporal power'. 'There is no compulsion in faith', says the Quran. Force is to be used in Islam only when its opponents depend on the argument of force alone. All that a Muslim is and a Muslim has are part of a Divine Trust. A Muslim cannot, without betraying that trust, hold anything back if it is required for the defence of the Faith and for serving the purposes of God. That is the rationale of the necessity to temporal power for the successors of the Prophet. Since the world still relies on force, the Khalifa cannot dispense with temporal power.

To come to our claims, Sir, the first claim that we put forward is that the Khalifat must be preserved by the entire body of Muslims at all times with adequate temporal power. The standard of temporal power necessary for the preservation of the Khilafat must obviously, therefore, be a relative one. Not going into the matter more fully, we would say that after the various wars in which Turkey has been engaged recently, and after the Balkan War particularly, the Empire of the Khalifa was reduced to such low limits that Muslims considered the irreducible minimum of temporal power adequate for

the defence of the Faith to be the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*.

Nevertheless, Muslims have not by any means ruled out such political changes within the scheme of Turkey's sovereignty as would guarantee security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development of all communities, whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish, consistently with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign State.

The Prime Minister : Does that mean, for instance, that you are opposed to the act of the Syrian Mohammedans who declared Emir Feisal King of Arabia ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I was coming to that presently, but since you have asked me that question, I should like to say that we think this matter can well be left for settlement amongst Muslims. Just as we have certain religious obligations with regard to the Khilafat that have brought us here, we have other religious obligations, equally solemn and binding, that require us to approach the Turks and Arabs. 'All Muslims are brothers, wherefore make peace between your brethren,' is a Quranic injunction. We have come here in the interests of peace and reconciliation, and propose going to the Arab and Turks for the same purpose.

The Prime Minister : I am rather on the question of temporal power for the Khalifa, because your proposition was that the power which was enjoyed by the Sultan at the beginning of this war represented the irreducible minimum of temporal power. Now I understand, though I have had only very imperfect reports, that the Mahomedans of Syria and Palestine and some other parts have proclaimed an independent Moslem State torn away from the Khalifa.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I hope, Sir, it will be possible for us, if we are given an opportunity to meet those people, to reconcile them. There have been differences between the Arabs and the Turks, but I hope that Emir Feisal, when he looks upon the matter from the point of view of a Muslim, as he is bound to do, will realise that his own personal ambitions, and even the embitions of the Arabs, can be entirely satisfied within the scheme of Turkish sovereignty.

The Prime Minister : That means that you are opposed to the independence of Arabia.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : Yes, I was suggesting that Mussulmans did not by any means, when asking for the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, rule out changes which would guarantee to the Christians, Jews and Mussulmans, within the scheme of the Ottoman sovereignty, security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development, so long as it is consistent with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign State. It will not be a difficult matter. We have here an Empire in which the various communities live together. Some already are sufficiently independent and others hope—and here I refer to India—to get a larger degree of autonomy

that they possess at the present moment; and consistently with our desire to have autonomous development ourselves, we could not think of denying it to Arabs or Jews or Christians within the Turkish Empire. I think our own Empire provides for us means whereby this thing could be assured.

Quite apart from the main claim for the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power, the Muslims claim that the local centre of their faith—namely, the 'Island of Arabia'—should remain inviolate and entirely in Muslim control. This is based on the dying injunction of the Prophet himself. The Jazirat-ul-Arab, as its name indicates, is the 'Island of Arabia', the fourth boundary being the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It therefore includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, as well as the region commonly known to European geographers as the Arabian peninsula. Muslims can acquiesce in no form of non-Muslim control, whether in the shape of mandates or otherwise, over any portion of this region. A religious requirement, which is absolutely binding on us, requires that at least there shall be exclusively Muslim control. It does not specify that it should be the Khalifa's own control. In order to make it perfectly clear, I may say the religious requirements, Sir, will be satisfied even if the Emir Feisal exercises independent control there. But since we have got to provide sufficient territories and resources and naval and military forces for the Khalifa, the requirement of the utmost economy which has to rule and govern all our claims in these matters suggests that both these requirements may easily be satisfied if the Jazirat-ul-Arab remains as before the war, under the direct sovereignty of the Khalifa. We have great hopes that if we have opportunities of meeting our co-religionists we shall bring about a reconciliation between them and the Turks. After all, it cannot be said that Turkish rule in Arabia has been of such a character that other Powers are bound to interfere. We have not heard of any atrocities, at any rate, here; and you must have seen, Sir, that in that one region where there was at one time a great struggle going on, Yemen, they did not part company with the Turks in this war.

The third claim that the Mussulmans have charged us with putting before you is based on a series of injunctions which require the Khalifa to be the warden of the three sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem: and overwhelming Muslim sentiment requires that he should be the warden of the shrines of Najaf, Karbala, Kazimain, Samarra and Baghdad, all of which are situated within confines of the 'Island of Arabia'.

Although Muslims rely on their religious obligations for the satisfaction of the claims which I have specified above, they naturally find additional support in your own pledge, Sir, with regard to Constantinople, Thrace, and Asia Minor, the populations of which are overwhelmingly Muslim. They trust that a pledge so solemnly given and recently renewed will be redeemed in its entirety. Although the same degree of sanctity cannot be claimed for Constantinople as for the three sacred Harams, Mecca, Medina,

and Jerusalem—Constantinople is nevertheless held very sacred by all the Muslims of the world, and the uninterrupted historic tradition of nearly five centuries has created such an overwhelming sentiment with regard to Istambol, or the 'City of Islam'—a title which no city has up to this time enjoyed, that a effort to drive the Turks out 'bag and baggage' from the seat of the Khilafat is bound to be regarded by the Moslems of the world as a challenge of the modern Crusaders to Islam and of European domination to the entire East, which cannot be taken up by the Muslim world or the East without great peril to our own Empire, and, in fact, to the allied dominions in Asia and Africa. In this connection, Sir, I might mention one point, that the Muslims cannot tolerate any affront to Islam in keeping the Khalifa as a sort of hostage in Constantinople. He is not the Pope at the Vatican, much less can he be the Pope at Avignon, and I am bound to say that the recent action of the Allied Powers is likely to give rise in the Muslim world to feelings which it will be very difficult to restrain, and which would be very dangerous to the peace of the world.

As regards Thrace, it is not necessary to support the Turkish claim for their retention of Thrace by any further arguments than that of the principle of self-determination. Its fair and honest application will ensure the satisfaction of that claim.

As regards Smyrna, the occupation of Smyrna by the Greeks, who were not even at war with Turkey, under the auspices of the Allies, has shaken to a great extent the confidence which Muslims reposed in the pledges given to them, and the atrocities perpetrated in that region have driven them, almost to despiration. Muslims discover no justification for this action except the desire of Greek capitalists to exploit the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor, which are admittedly the homelands of the Turks. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue, not only will the Turks be driven out, 'bag and baggage', from Europe, but he will have no 'bag and baggage' left to him, even in Asia. He would be paralysed, commercially and industrially, in a land-locked small Emirate in Asia Minor, the speedy bankruptcy of which is certain. The application of the principle of self-determination would entirely rule out the Greek claim in this fertile region, which obviously tempts the greed of the capitalist and the exploiter.

As regards Cilicia, reasons similar to those that have promoted the action of Greeks in Smyrna seem clearly to prompt the outcry of the Christian population in Cilicia, and obviously it is the Gulf of Alexandria which is attracting some people as the Gulf of Smyrna is attracting others.

I do not, Sir, overlook the fact of the massacres. No Muslim would dream of giving his support to those truly guilty of massacres and other equally revolting crimes. The Indian Khilafat Delegation must put on record their utter detestation of such conduct and their full sympathy for the sufferers, whether they be Christian or Muslim. But, if the Turk is to be punished as a criminal, and populations of other races and creeds are to be released from

their allegiance to the Ottoman Sovereign on the assumption that the Turks have been tyrants in the past and their rule is intolerable, then the delegation claim that the whole question of these massacres must be impartially investigated by an International Commission on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented. This we have already submitted to you, Sir, in the course of a telegram which we had the honour to send. Where casualties have in fact taken place, not only should their true extent be ascertained, but the Commission should go fully into the so-called massacres and the intrigues of Tsarist Russia in Asia Minor after the success of similar intrigues in the Balkans; it should go into the question of the organisation of revolutionary societies by the Christian subjects of the Sultan, the rebellious character of which was subversive of His rule; it should go into the provocation offered to the Moslem majority in this region, and the nature of the struggle between contending parties and the character of the force engaged on either side.

The Prime Minister : I am not quite sure about your argument here. Do you deny the existence of these massacres, or are you justifying them ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I neither deny their existence nor justify them in the least; I say that so far as we are concerned we are not in a position to affirm or to deny anything. We simply claim as Muslims—we are not Turks, but Muslims—that if on this assumption the Turk is to be punished in any way, then there should be a thorough and impartial enquiry.

The Prime Minister : In the reply which the Turkish Delegation gave to us in Paris they admitted these massacres. Their only reply was that a much larger number of Muslims had been massacred by misgovernment in Asia Minor.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : If you will permit me to say so, I will say that I think the Turks themselves are in a much better position than we are to say who actually represent them and who do not represent them; but I do not think that any large section of the Turkish population considers that the delegates who came over to Paris some time ago did truly represent them. I am not associated—although it is suggested I am associated—in any way with the Committee of Union and Progress; I have had no intercourse with them; I do not even know the names of prominent members of the Committee. Once only did I send a message, under the auspices of the Government of India, to Talaat Bey, as he then was, the Minister of the Interior, asking him not to enter the war—to think a thousand times before he entered the war, and explaining that our position in India would be extremely sad if they entered the war against England. That is my only connection with it.

The Prime Minister : That was very sound advice; I wish they had taken it. We never sought the war with Turkey.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I quite understand that.

The Prime Minister : We certainly never dreamt of it; and the declaration of war was by Turkey against us.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I think we should have been utilised at that time as a powerful leverage by the British Government we loyal Mussulmans. We could have been utilised with some success in bringing home to the Turks what they were going in for at the time. However, that is a thing of the past.

The Prime Minister : Let me have a copy of the Turkish Memorandum.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : It was published in the 'Times', and I have read it in India. With regard to that I would say that what one party says about the other party cannot always be relied upon. If the Turks are to be punished, it will not be His Excellency Ferid Pasha, or people of his way of thinking. The people probably who were in power at the time would be considered war criminals today. I have no brief for them; I have no brief for the Turks; I have only a brief for Islam and the Indian Muslims. What we say is this, as I said to Mr. Fisher—let there be a thorough enquiry, and if this thorough enquiry is carried out, and if it establishes to the satisfaction of the world that the Turks really have been guilty of unprovoked murders, and have been guilty of these atrocities and horrible crimes, then we will wash our hands of the Turks. To us it is much more important that not a single stain should remain on the fair name of Islam. We want to convert the whole world to our way of thinking, but with what face could we go before the whole world and say we are the brethren of murderers and massacrers ? But we know the whole history of these massacres to some extent. It is only in Armenia that the Turk is said to be so intolerant; there are other parts of the world where he deals with the Jewish community. No complaints of massacres come from those communities. Then the Armenians themselves lived under Turkish rule for centuries and never complained. The farthest back that we can go to discover any trace of this is the beginning of the last century. But in reality the 'massacres' begin only in the last quarter of the last century. It is pretty clear that they begin after the success of efforts like those made in the Balkans by Russia, which has never disguised its desire to take Constantinople since the time of Peter the Great. It has always wanted to go to Tsargrad, as it called it, that is, the city of the Tsars. They wanted to go there. They tried these things in the Balkans, and they succeeded beyond their expectation, only probably Bulgaria became too independent when it became Greater Bulgaria. But in the Armenians, they had people who were not very warlike, who had no sovereign ambitions themselves, and who were also to a great extent afraid of conversion to another branch of the Orthodox Church, the Russian branch, so that they were not very willing tools. Still, they were egged on, and plots and intrigues went on all the time. These people were incited, and they understood that if they made a compromise with Tsarist Russia they would get something better. It was then that these massacres came on the scene. No doubt there have been several outcries about them; some evidence has been produced; but there has been no thorough international enquiry which would satisfy the entire world, Muslim as well as

Christian. It is in that connection that we earnestly appeal to you, to the whole of Christendom, or the whole of Europe and America, that if the Turk is to be punished on the assumption that he is a tyrant, that his rule is a blasting tyranny, and that he ought to be punished, in that case the evidence does not exist today. Even in today's '*Times*' we read about these 'innocent lambs'—I do not use the word in any spirit of bitterness towards the Armenian Christians—we are not here to add to the prevailing bitterness, but to lessen it if we can--we read in today's *Times* of the horrors perpetrated by these very people. We see the propaganda that is being carried on from day to day in this country, and from that one would judge that these Armenians are innocent people, probably a large majority of the people who are ruled by Pashas and Effendis who were in a minority, and were capitalists who were grinding the people and massacring them all the time. Englishmen and other European Christians who have been in Turkish territory consider that the Turk is a very humane person. I do not know what the possibly could have happened to the Turk that all of a sudden he loses all his humanity in Armenia and becomes the cruel tyrant that all of us, Christians and Muslims alike, must abhor. Therefore, if any decisions is to be based on that assumption, the evidence must be such that it is entirely above suspicion. We have not to deal only with a few people who may be convinced that the Turk is not being punished because he is a Muslim. We have to deal with millions of people, from whose minds the wrong impression should be removed. I am absolutely certain that you and your Government are as anxious as any of us that there should not be the least suspicion that you are going to deal with the Turkish question in the spirit of the Crusaders, or of European domination. We, too, want to create that impression in the East If we have not come for reconciliation we would not have come here. We have come for reconciliation, to ask for a real and true peace in the world. I can quite understand that great dea'y has taken place in concluding peace with Turkey. The Government has pointed out that the British are not responsible for that. Nor are we, nor, probably, are the Turks. Six months or a year is not too long a time for a proper investigation if a truly final settlement which would sow the seed of future wars.

I do not like to tire your patience, Sir, by going on much longer. Our request simply is this, for a thorough and impartial enquiry on which the All India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented. I said to Mr. Fisher when we were before him that, if the Turk is really such a person, and the Khilafat has such a Government, apart from any consideration for the Christian point of view, we have to consider from our own point of view, as Muslim, whether such a Khilafat could be tolerated any longer. We have the tradition of the Prophet's own grandson, Hosain, who had only 72 followers when he opposed the larger forces of Yazid, and died on the field of Karbala because no true Muslim could owe any allegiance to such a tyrant. If the Turk is a bigger tyrant than Yazid, how can we owe allegiance to that

bigger tyrant ? If that is proved to the satisfaction of Mussulmans, the whole question of the Khilafat will have to go into the melting-pot. That will be a most serious thing, but we are bound to do it in the interests of Islam itself.

I think I might now turn to the Jewish claims in Palestine. The Delegation have no desire to cause an injustice to the Jewish community, and I think Islam can look back with justifiable pride on its treatment of this community in the past. No aspiration of the Jewish community which is reasonable can be incompatible with Moslem control of the Holy Land, and it is hoped that the Ottoman Government will easily accommodate the Jewish community in such aspirations of theirs as are reasonable. Some responsible propagandists of the Zionist movement with whom I have had conversations frankly admit : 'We do not want political sovereignty there; we want a home; the details can be arranged and discussed'. I asked them : 'Do you mean the Great Britain herself should be the sovereign power there, or should be the mandatory?', and they said : 'No, what we want is an ordinary humanly speaking reasonable guarantee that opportunities of autonomous development would be allowed to us'. We, ourselves, who have been living in India, are great believers in a sort of Federation of Faiths. I think the Indian nationationality which is being built up to-day will probably be one of the first examples in the world of a Federation of Faiths, and we cannot rule out the possibility of development in Palestine on the lines of 'cultural autonomy'. The Jews are, after all, a very small minority there, and I do not believe for one moment that Jews could be attracted there in such large numbers as the Zionist enthusiasts sometimes think. I would say the same thing of an Armenian State, without desiring to say one word which would be considered offensive to any class of people. Because we ourselves have suffered so many humiliations, we do not like ourselves to say anything about other people that they would resent. If the Allied Powers brought all the Armenians together and placed them all in a contiguous position, excluding the present Kurdish community from them, no matter what large slice of land you gave them, I think they would very much like to go back to the old status.

The Prime Minister : Are you talking now of the Armenians ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : Yes, in the same way I would say of the Jewish community that they are people who prosper very much in other lands, and although they have a great hankering after their home, and no community is so much bound up with a particular territory as the Jewish community is, still I must say that we do not fear there will be any great migration of such a character that it will make a majority over the Muslim population. The Jewish community has said : 'We have no objection to Turkish sovereignty remaining in that part of the world so long as we are allowed to remain and prosper there and develop on our own lines, and have cultural autonomy.'

With regard to the Arabs, about whom you asked me little while ago, the Delegation are not apprehensive with regard to the feasibility of an adjust-

ment between the Khalifa and the Arabs. As I have already pointed out, there is the Quranic injunction : 'All Muslims are brothers, wherefore make peace between your brethren.' That is a duty laid upon us, and recently, at the Bombay Session, the All India Khilafat Conference passed a resolution authorising a Delegation to proceed to the Hedjaz and other parts of Arabia to reconcile the Arabs and the Turks. Our interest is in the Khilafat as Mussulmans. No population and no territory could be so dear to the Muslim as the Arabs and Arabia. The Turks could not win such affection from us as the Arabs do. This is the land that we want to keep purely under Muslim control. Even if the Arabs themselves want a mandate in that country we will not consent. We are bound by our religious obligations to that extent. Therefore, it cannot be through antipathy against the Arabs or because of any particular sympathy for the Turks that we desire the Khalifa's sovereignty over the Island of Arabia. The Turks are much further removed from us. Very few of us have travelled in the Turkish Empire. But we do go in large numbers to Mecca and Medina. So many of us want to die there. So many Mussulmans settle down and marry in Arabia; one of my own aunts is an Arab lady. Wherever we have met Arabs on our journey—we have had no opportunity, of course, of discussing the subject with well-educated people, but we have asked the class of people we have met what they thought of the action of the King of the Hedjaz—'King' in a land where God alone is recognised as a King; nobody can ever claim Kingship there. They said his was an act that they condemned; it was as act they did not in the least like. They considered it to be wrong: the Arabs spoke disparagingly of it. I do not know to what extent it may be true, but there is a number of people who now come forward as apologists for the Arabs. They say that what Emir Faisal and the Sharif did was to save something for Islam; it was not that they were against the Turks, but they were for Islam. Whether this was or was not the fact, it is very significant that such apologies should be made now. Honestly, we have no apprehensions that we could not reconcile the Arabs and the Turks. This is a question which I think the Allied Council, the Peace Conference, could very well leave the Mussulmans to settle amongst themselves. We do not want British bayonets to force the Arabs into a position of subservience to the Turks. That can be very easily arranged, and if such a Federation as we dream of becomes a reality—and I do not see why it should not—the Arabs would have all the independence they require. They may claim national independence, but they cannot forget that Islam is something other than national, that it is supernational, and the Khilafat must be as dear to them as it is to us. Even now the King of the Hedjaz does not claim to be the Khalifa. When people began to address him as such he rebuked them, and he published in his official organ, *Al Qibla*, that he wanted to be called King of Hedjaz, and no Amir-ul-Muminin, a title reserved only for the Khalifa.

The Prime Minister : What does that mean ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : The Commander of the Faithful; he commands

them within the law of Islam and on behalf of God. He does not arrogate to himself a kingly function. I think, Sir, that will appeal to you personally that the doctrine of the Khilafat is the doctrine of a Republic, and that, alone among all the sovereigns of the world the one whose coronation ceremony does not take place in a palace is the Khalifa. He has to go to the tomb of Hazrat Ayyoub Ansari, a companion of the Prophet sent for the conquest of Constantinople, and there offer, his prayers and gird the sword of Mohamed the Conqueror.

The Prime Minister : Is it hereditary ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : That is a point which will clear up the whole question of the Khalifa. Islam required temporal power for the defence of the Faith, and for that purpose, if the ideal combination of piety and power could not be achieved, the Muslims said, 'Let us get hold of the most powerful person, even if he is not the most pious, so long as he places his power at the disposal of our piety.' That is why we agreed to accept Muslim Kings, the Omayyids and the Abbasids, as Khalifas, now the Sultans of Turkey. They have a peculiar succession of their own. We have accepted it for the time being because we must have the strongest Mussulman power at our disposal to assist us in the defence of the Faith. That is why we have accepted it. If the Turks agreed with other Muslims, and all agreed that the Khalifa may be chosen out of any Muslim community. no matter who he was, the humblest of us might be chosen, as they used to be chosen in the days of the first four Khalifas, the Khulafa-i-Rashideen or truly guided Khalifas. In that case all the power of Islam could once more be put at the disposal of the most pious amongst us. If that happened the Muslims would be over-joyed. But of course we have to make allowances for human nature. The Turkish Sultan in 1517 did not like to part with his power any more than the Mamluke rulers of Egypt liked to part with their power when they gave asylum to a scion of the Abbasids after the sack of Baghdad in 1258.

May I now sum up the claims we here put forward ? If the Khalifa retains his wardenship of the Holy Places, which he can very well do if the exclusive control over every part of the Island of Arabia is retained by the Khalifa himself, and if your own pledge, Sir, is redeemed in full, whilst the 12th point of the President of the United States on the basis of which the Armistice was concluded, is observed, then the result would be the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, which Muslims claim as the irreducible minimum for the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power. Indian Muslims are anxious for reconciliation; reconciliation, and not revenge, should be your watchword also. Even if the Turks have been to blame in the past, Indian Muslims are more interested than any other body of people in seeing that such allegations as have been made against the Turks in the past should not be possible in the future. They mean to exercise their influence, which is sure to increase if a just and generous settlement is concluded with Turkey, to secure the future peace of the world, to secure a

good government in Turkey, and to secure the reconciliation of Turkey with Great Britain and her Allies. As I said before, His Majesty has a very powerful lever in his Muslim subjects, which should be used far more extensively and effectively than it has been in the past.

I will say just one word with regard to the feeling in India, and then I will conclude, but I ask that my colleague, Mr. Syud Hossain, be allowed to supplement what I have said on certain points that he may like to select.

The Prime Minister : What has he got to supplement ? Surely you have put the whole case very fully ?

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I think I might leave him to explain to you the feeling that prevails in India at the present moment.

Mr. Syud Hossain : There is just one point I should like to clear up. When talking about Arabia you said to Mr. Mohamed Ali, 'Then you are opposed to independence for Arabia ?' and he said 'Yes'. I think that needs to be qualified a little. We are not opposed to the independence of Arabia. We are opposed to Emir Feisal's declaration of independence only for this reason—that Arabia, throughout the history of Islam, has up till now remained under the direct control of the Khalifa. This is the first time in the history of Islam that anyone who is not the Khalifa has set up any claim over Arabia. That is why there is, from the Muslim point of view, a conflict of religious obligations with actual facts. We are not opposed to Arabian independence. On the contrary, we wish very much for complete autonomy in that region, but we want it to be in harmony and not in conflict with the Khilafat and its claims. The idea is not unfeasible, as both Arabs and Turks are Muslims. I have only one other point to put before you, and that is in regard to the feeling in India at present. As you know, this Delegation has been sent by the All India Khilafat Conference which is not a purely Muslim organisation. Besides Muslims it includes most of the foremost leaders of the Hindu community also, and I should just like to state why it is that they are with us in this matter. There has been a very extraordinary growth of Hindu-Muslim unity in India in recent years, and it reached its climax, if I may say so, the moment the Hindus, after realising that this question really was a matter of the deepest concern to Muslims, came into this movement with us. I would just emphasise this—Hindus and Muslims under British rule were to be separate. When the Indian National Congress was first founded, Muslims were almost openly opposed to the whole movement, but gradually Muslims came into the Congress and gradually this national movement has been built up, until today we have this extraordinary fact—that Hindus and Mussulmans are identified and united on what is really a communal question. The point I should like to put before you is this. We are on the eve of a new era in India. That is generally admitted. Here we have this solid fact of Hindu-Muslim unity. The British Empire is the greatest Muslim Power in the world, and if this question of 'Jazirat-ul-Arab' which is, as we believe you are aware, a fundamentally religious question which has affected not any one class or

another of Muslims, but all classes, and in fact most of all those classes that are not ordinarily indentified with domestic politics—if this question which affects every single Muslim unit in India, were solved in such a manner that they might be sure that their religious obligations remained inviolate, then we should have within the British Empire this solid unit of Islam and India—I mean non-Muslim India—and for the British Commonwealth the friendship of the Muslim world. The world is undergoing very many phases of transformation, but if this Indo-Islamic-British unity could be achieved on a basis of reality and of real contentment all round it would certainly be a very splendid fulfilment of the destiny of the British Empire. That is all I have to say.

The Prime Minister : Gentlemen, you have put your case with very great lucidity and with moderation, and as the head of a Government which, as the last speaker has very well said, has to deal with an Empire which is the largest Mahommedan Empire in the world, I feel bound to listen with great care to everything that comes from our Mussulman fellow-subjects in any part of the Empire. When we were in Paris we took great care to consider the Mussulman representatives who came from India. They were represented in the first instance with very great force by two able Indians who were not Mahommedan but who still were very much imbued with a sense of what was fair to their Mahommedan fellow-countrymen. The Maharajah of Bikaner and Lord Sinha repeatedly brought the case before the Delegation, a Delegatlon of the British Empire, not merely a Delegation of Great Britain, but of the Dominions as well. They formed a part of that Delegation themselves. Then Delegation were arranged from Mahommedans, some resident in Great Britain, and some who came from India, and at my request the Supreme Council of the Allies heard their case. M. Clemenceau, Mr. President Wilson, Senor Orlando, and myself, representing the Great Powers of the Alliance, listened with great care to a very powerful presentation of the Mussulman of India to feel that their case has been presented with great care and with great force, and has been listened to with conscientious care not merely by the delegates of the British Empire, but, at the request of the delegates of the British Empire, by the Supreme Council of the Allies. Whatever decision we came to, we arrived at after listening to and weighing very carefully all the arguments, all the facts, all the considerations and all the appeals which came from Mahommedans in every part of the world.

The second thing I want to say is this. I should like to get out of the mind of any Mussulman throughout the Empire that we are treating Turkey upon different principles to those we applied when we came to consider Christian countries. We were at war with three Christian countries and one Mahommedan country. We did not seek war with any of them. The governors of Turkey took upon themselves to wage war upon us. Nothing was farther from our minds at the beginning of the conflict with Germany than that we should have to make war with Turkey. I do not believe we have ever made war against Turkey. We have been fighting for Turkey many times. One of the

greatest wars we ever made was to save Turkey from the rapacity of Russia—I mean the Crimean War. In 1878 we very nearly went to war with Russia again on behalf of Turkey. We have never in my recollection waged war upon Turkey. There have been one or two small incidents which were inevitable, but we have never waged war upon Turkey. We have waged war for Turkey. We very nearly got engaged in another gigantic war for Turkey, but we have never fought Turkey. And Turkey, at a moment when we were engaged in the most terrible struggle this country has ever been in or which any other country has ever been in suddenly declared war upon us. It was vital to us in the great struggle that we should have free access to the Black Sea. The fact that we had not got free access prolonged the war by at least two years. Turkey suddenly slammed the gates in the face of an old ally who had always stood by her and who had no quarrel with her of any sort or kind at that time. The governors of Turkey, Talaat Pasha and Enver Pasha, slammed the gates in our face and undoubtedly imperilled the whole cause of the Allies. I do not believe France has ever made war upon Turkey. I have no recollection of it. France has been quite friendly to Turkey. France was engaged on our side in the Crimean War, supporting Turkey, and the same thing happened to France. So I do not want any Mahommedan in India to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam.* Nothing was farther from our minds than to have a quarrel with Islam in any part of the world at that moment. Repeatedly during the war by every means in our power we did our best to bring it to an end by friendly means. Our quarrel was not with Turkey. Our death struggle was with Germany and the German Military Power, and we deeply regretted that the Young Turkish Party should have misled their country and brought Turkey into war with us. I do not believe Turkey really wanted to quarrel with Great Britain. I am talking now of the majority of the population of Turkey. As I say, we deeply regretted that their rulers should have misled their country into fighting with their old allies and friends, Great Britain. That is the position. But they insisted upon fighting with us. They insisted on slamming the door against us and thus prevented our getting through to help Roumania and Russia. By that means the war undoubtedly was prolonged for two years.

Now Turkey has been beaten. So has Germany. So has Austria. Austria has fallen to pieces. She was an Empire. What is she now ? She has fallen to

* Mr. Lloyd George, in one of his recent speechs, said :

'The name of General Allenby will be ever renowned as that of the brilliant commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the Crusades. It was his good fortune, by his skill, to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose in vain, and a British army under the command of General Allenby achieved it, and achieved it finally.'

bits, and her fragments are scattered about. But she is not a Mussulman country. She is a Christian country. Therefore it is no use talking about crusades. We have no crusade against Austria. She has paid the penalty of defeat. She has gone to pieces. What has happened in Germany ? We have taken Lorraine away from Germany. The whole of Poland has been taken away from her, and we have imposed upon her very stern and seveor terms. But she is a Christian country. She is not Mussulman. Why should we do it ? Because we are applying the principle of self-determination to these countries which oppressed subject peoples and provoked war to destroy liberty throughout the world. In Austria the Czecho-Slovaks say : 'We no longer want to remain under Austria.' We say, 'Very well; Austria has forfeited its title to Empire. We will make you independent'. The Jugo-Slavs say the same thing. We say, 'Very well, make a Government of your own with Serbia.' Transylvania says the same thing, and we say, 'Very well, you may unite with your fellow-Roumanians in Roumania'. We apply the principles of self-determination to the subjects of the autocratic Empires. I do not want any Mussulman in India therefore to imagine that we are applying one principle to Christians and another principle to Mahommedans. But neither do I want any Mussulman in India to imagine that we are going to abandon, when we come to Turkey, the principles which we have ruthlessly applied to Christian countries like Germany and Austria.

I do not understand Mr. Mohamed Ali to claim indulgence for Turkey. He claims justice, and justice she will get. Austria has had justice. Germany has had justice—pretty terrible justice. Why should Turkey escape ? Turkey thought she had a fend with us. What fend had Turkey with us ? Why did she come in to try and stab us and destroy liberty throughout the world when we were engaged in this life and death struggle ? Is there any reason why we should apply a different measure to Turkey to that which we have meted out to the Christian communities of Germany and Austria ? I want the Mahommedans in India to get it well into their minds that we are not treating Turkey severely because she is Mahommedan; we are applying exactly the same principle to her as we have applied to Austria. which is great Christian community.

What are those principles ? They are the principles of self-determination applied to Empires which have forfeited their title to rule. The Arabs have claimed independence. The have proclaimed Feisal King of Syria. They have claimed that they should be severed from Turkish dominion. Is it suggested that the Arabs should remain under Turkish dominon merely because they are Mahommedans ? Is not the same measure of independence and freedom to be given to Mahommedans as is given to Christians ? Groatia has demanded freedom, and we have given it to her. It is a Christian community. Syria has demanded it and it is given to her. We are applying exactly the same principles in Christian places, and to impose the dominion of the Sultan upon Arabia, which ha nc desire for it, is to impose upon Arabs something which we

certainly would not dream of imposing upon these Christian communities.

Now I come to the other points. One is Thrace. It is very difficult to get the facts about Thrace, but I have got before me here the Turkish census and the Greek census about Thrace. There is very little difference between them. According to both of these, the Mussulman population in Thrace is in a considerable minority. If that is true and the principle of self-determination is to be applied, the whole of Thrace would certainly be taken away from Turkish rule. Take Smyrna. The same thing applies there. We had a most careful investigation by a very impartial Committee into the whole of the question of the Province of Smyrna. We found that a considerable majority of the population was non-Turk. There were Mussulmans there who were Greeks. But the great majority of the population undoubtedly prefer Greek rule to Turkish rule, so I understand.

What is the other case which is put ? It is the question of the temporal power of the Khalifa. The question of the temporal power of a spiritual head is not confined to Islam, as Mr. Mohamed Ali knows very well. It is one of the great controversies of Christendom too. We have had here one of the most fierce controversies, which raged for ever a generation, as to the temporal power of the head of the Roman Catholic Church. There are Roman Catholics who believe in it, and there are Roman Catholics who do not believe in it. I am not going to express any opinion. But after the Pope was deprived of his temporal power his spiritual power was as great as and very likely greater than ever. I am not going to interfere in a religious discussion where men of the same faith take a different view. I know of Mahommedans, sincere, earnest, zealous Mussulmans, who take a very different view of the temporal power to the one which is taken by Mr. Mohamed Ali today, just as I know of Catholics who take one view and other Catholics who take a very different view of the temporal power of the Pope. That is a controversy into which I do not propose to enter. All I know is this. The Turk will exercise temporal power in Turkish lands. We do not propose to deprive him of Turkish lands. Neither do we propose that they should retain power over lands which are not Turkish. Why ? Because that is the principle we are applying to the Christian communities of Europe. The same principles must be applied to the Turks.

As to the Armenian massacres, there is no doubt about them-none. Mr. Mohamed Ali says there has not been an impartial investigation. That is true; because the worst massacres of all occurred during the war, and there was no one there to investigate. I quote, however, the reply given by the Turkish emissaries in Paris, the representatives of the Turkish Government, on the subjects. Their sole answer was that the Committee of Union and Progress, who were in power at that time and ordered the massacre of the Armenians, had also committed crimes against Muslims, and condemned to death by every means 30,00,C00 of Muslims. That is no answer. It is not a question of punishment; it is a question of good government; and whether it is 8,00,000

Christians or 30,00,000 Muslims, a Government which cannot protect its own subjects, whether they are Christian or Muslim, against wholesale massacres of that kind is not fit to govern. Therefore we are bound, in the interests of civilization, to exercise some sort of control and supervision. It is quite clear that the Turkish Government is incapable, as at present constituted, of protecting its own subjects. Let us take the facts. The Turk is not such a very old Government in Asia Minor. We talk as if the Turk had always been the owner of Asia Minor. He has not. All we know is that it is a very badly governed country. It was once a very rich country. It was a country which was not only rich, but it enriched other lands. It is rich no longer. It is devastated; it is desolate. You must take that into account. Here is a bad farmer in a farm which is essential to the world. At one time it was the granary of the Mediterranean. It is so no longer. You really cannot allow them to desolate and to devastate this country without some say on the part of the civilised countries of the world in the matter. The Turk has no right to say 'This is my country, and if I like to desolate it that is my business'. No country, has a right to do that. It is not a question of race; it is not a question of Christian; it is not a question of Muslim. If there had been Christians there who had devasted a great country like this, which is essential to the world, we should have said exactly the same thing. Here is Europe suffering from scarcity. We are so interdependent, not merely European countries, upon each other, but Europe upon Asia and Asia upon Europe, that we have all got an interest in seeing that large tracts of territory are not laid waste by misgovernment. That is our common interest in control in Asia Minor. If the Turk were a capable and efficient administrator who looked after his land well there is not a Christian community in Europe that would not say: 'God bless you and prosper you', and we would not dream of interfering. We should be glad to see him work out his own faith in his own land. But I do not think he has governed in a way which makes Islam proud of him. I will ask you to look at the way in which he has done it. Is Islam really proud of Turkish dominion ?

All I want to say in conclusion is this. I want to give this feeling to the Mussulmans of India who stood loyally by the Throne and by the Empire with very few exceptions—and there were exceptions even amongst Christians. Therefore I draw no distinction to the detriment of the Mussulmans of India because there were some amongst them who were disloyal. There are Christians who were also disloyal, and therefore I do not say this in the slightest degree as a criticism of Mahommedanism. The Mussulmans of India stood by the Throne and the Empire. We gratefully acknowledge it. They helped us in the struggle. We willingly and gladly recognise that. We recognise that they have a right to be heard in a matter which affects especially Islam. We have heard them. Not merely have we heard them, but we have very largely deferred to their wishes in the matter. The settlement was very largely affected by the opinion of India and especially the Mussulmans

of India. But we cannot apply different principles in the settlement of a Mahommedan country to those which we sternly applied in our settlement with the Christian communities with whom we were also at war.

That is all I have to say, and I thank you for putting your case before me and putting it so clearly.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : May I make just one or two observations ? I will not say one word with regard to the Turkish declaration of war. Really we are not charged either to defend it or to say anything about it; but one consideration I think should be before His Majesty's Government. It was not a case merely of Great Britain and the Turkish Empire. After all, there was a great alliance, and the Turks may have, I do not say that they had this in view, been alarmed by the fact that the Tsar of Russia, their ancient enemy, was one of the allies of Great Britain. I am absolutely certain that no Turk would have dreamt of going to war with England or with France if it had been merely a case of England or France.

The Prime Minister : I want to make it absolutely clear that we had no understanding of any sort or kind with Russia when we entered into the war, to the detriment of Turkey, none. There was no discussion, as far as I know upon the subject, and I am obsolutely certain there was no agreement, either secret or open, when we entered into the war. So Turkey had no reason to fear anything from our having engaged in a war on the side of Russia. Our war was against Germany, and we had not Turkey in our minds in the least.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : With reference to these crimes and atrocities, we come back again after all to this. All the case for despoiling the Turks rests upon this—that the Turk has been intolerant and a bad and inept ruler.

The Prime Minister : An inefficient ruler.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : Well, Sir, in that case I think I shall be discharging the duty which we have had laid upon us by our people by merely saying that, with regard to our religious obligations, it is not possible to compromise. We have our duties to our faith in matters of that kind. Our obligations are there and must be respected at all times. You will not find one Mussulman—I do not know to what exceptions you particularly referred—we have no access to the Government's records but there was no Mussulman in India who wantonly betrayed the allegiance that he owed to His Majesty. Mussulmans have obligations imposed on them by their religion, and their loyalty to His Majesty is entirely conditioned by perfect freedom in matters of their faith. We have been charged with the duty of putting the case before you with regard to the preservation of the temporal power of the Khalifa, with regard to the Khalifa's wardenship of the Holy Places, and with regard to exclusive Muslim control. We explained that to the Viceroy and we explained that to Mr. Fisher when he received us. With reference to these matters we have our religious obligations, and we must always place these first.

The Prime Minister : I do not think we can reopen this; otherwise we might go on all night.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I thank you on behalf of the Delegation for having received us. We shall communicate what you have said to our people.

(The Delegation then withdrew)

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

66

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION AT ESSEX HALL
23 March 1920

The meeting was held at the Essex Hall on March 23rd, to hear the members of the Khilafat Delegation. It was organised by Mr. Arthur Field, the Secretary of the Anglo-Ottoman Society.

The chair was occupied by Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, President of the Society, and in addition to the members of the Delegation, Messrs. Mohamed Ali, Syed Hosain, and Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, there were present on the platform Doctor Abdul Majid of the Islamic Society, Mr. J. M. Parikh, representing the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Indian Christian Community, Mr. M. T. Kadarbhoy, a Shiah gentleman representing the Anjumani Ziaul-Islam of Bombay, Mr. B. G. Horniman, Editor, '*Bombay Chronicle*', Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, the Indian Poetess, representing the Hindus of India, Mr. Leland Buxton, Mr. Arnold Lupton, and Mr. Douglas Fox Pitt.

Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, The Chairman, said : Ladies and gentlemen, this meeting was arranged before Mr. Llyod George received the Indian Khilafat Delegation, and made his remarkable reply to them. I must say, as one who can claim to be an authority on the Turkish problem, having been acquainted with the problems of Turkey and the peoples of the Turkish Empire, and studied them for 25 years—I do not suppose Mr. Llyod George has studied them for 25 minutes--that I was ashamed and very sad to read that answer in an English newspaper. I contained statements that any Orientalist can traverse, and it contained downright misrepresentations. (Cheers). We who have been fighting for years to save the tie of loyalty and mutual affection which exists between England and her Eastern Empire cannot take so ill-informed a reply as representative of the mind of England and as an absolutely final answer on an important a question. (Hear, hear). As you know, Czarist Russia was for centuries the villain of the Turkish question, and in the old days, England as the friend of liberty and progress, used occasionally to protect the Turks from Russian villainy. Then there arose a

school of politicians here who had the vision of a re-united Christiandom which should dominate, convert, and exploit non-Christian peoples in the world, and they saw in Holy Russia the chief means of realising it. Their plan was very fine, no doubt, from their point of view, but it was absolutely incompatible with the welfare and prolonged existence of a British Empire based upon religious tolerance. You can see the result of it today—on the one hand a League of Nations, Christian nations bent on spoliation, and on the other hand the British Empire seething with discontent, estranged and misgoverned. From the moment England turned her back upon her great traditions, and became attached to Russia, Turkey has had foul play and calumny from us. The whole Eastern world knows that, but the British public have been kept in the dark about it. Our Russian alliance was exceedingly offensive to all Oriental subjects of the British Empire. There is no doubt about that. The British Government itself became aware of it, and having tacitly and in principle accept[illegible] Russian policy, which included the destruction of the Turkish Empire, they evolved a series of insentient and reckless projects which I imagine were suggested to our doctrinaires by some of the Czar's Oriental experts, with a view, of course, to gratify the Muslims. The result of our wartime propaganda against Turkey upon the people it was meant to please was such that the authorities in India and in Egypt had to give assurances contradicting that propaganda, to keep the people quiet even while Czarist Russia survived. When Czarist Russia fell, there was intense relief. Mr. Llyod George's speech of January 5, 1918, was received as an earnest of a change of policy. It kept the people quiet until the beginning of 1919, when it was known that Mr. Llyod George in Paris was ignoring his own solemn promise. The landing at Smyrna and the murder and devastation which followed caused a thrill of horror. From that time onward the people of India have been claiming their right as Oriental subjects of the British Empire to have their views upon an Oriential question, which affects them far more closely than any native of these islands, strongly and effectively expressed by the representatives of that Empire, and by no other representatives. (Cheers). What is that they ask ? Simply that England shall fulfil the solemn promise that she made to British subjects in preference to the compacts made with foreigners. If preference is given to the foreigner, membership of the British Empire has no value for the people of India. The Turkish regions—Thrace, Constantinople, Anatolia—must be left to Turkish sovereignty as England promised India that they should be. There is another demand, less generally understood, also connected with a promise made by England. The question of the Khilafat, we are assured, will not be interfered with, but the question of the Khilafat cannot be separated from the question of the Muslim Holy Land, the Holy Land of all monotheistic religions, including as it does Palestine and a part of Mesopotamia. That land must be in Muslim keeping under the Khalifa. If any part of it is torn away the Muslim world must fight for its recovery. The Khalifa's jurisdiction over that territory does not

preclude complete autonomy and right of self-government for the inhabitants, nor does it preclude the existence of local rulers of considerable power and dignity. It is in fact very largely a question of status and terminology. You may consider this demand, as Mr. Llyod George did, as strange, absurd, and even impudent. We conquered Palestine and Mesopotamia. But could we have conquered Palestine and Mesopotamia without India, without Egypt ? Could we hold Palestine and Mesopotamia in the future without India, without Egypt ? (Cheers). Then if you are Christians, you will say Palestine is our Holy Land. Well, if you wish to keep it Holy, leave it to the Muslims. If you wish for factories and sweated labour, cinema shows and cafe chantants in Jerusalem, then take it away from the Khalifa and the Sacred Law. The Delegation has come to warn us that the Empire is in danger. Whatever you may think of what they have to tell you, we must all admire their courage in coming here among us so simply and so sincerely on so dangerous an errand, for the danger of which they will speak is so great and imminent that at any moment they may find themselves cut off from a return to India, hostages in the hands of an angry British Government (Loud Applause).

Mr. Mohamed Ali : I have come here in the heart of domocracy from a part of the world which has been somewhat notorious for its autocratic ways even in the twentieth century. But I have found it very difficult to realise the great change that 7,000 miles of land and sea should have made. We found that a propaganda had been carried on here for a long time past by the enemies of the Turks. We could afford neither the money nor the morals for a similar propaganda in favour of our views. But something had to be done. The message with which we were charged had to be delivered; the warning which was entrusted to us had to be conveyed. We found very few indeed who could sympathise with the Turks, for, not only have the Turks fallen today on evil times, but, what is worse they have also fallen on evil tongues. Of course, there are Englishmen who know the Turks and they all sympathise with them. I have not yet come across a man who has fought against the Turks who does not speak well of them. (Hear, hear). But there is the large mass of stay-at-home Britons who do not know the Turk at all, and harbour the prejudices so sedulously sought by his enemies to be eternally perpetuated. In these circumstances people has come to us and said : 'Do not rub the English people the wrong way. If you go to them wearing the mantle of moderation you will succeed'. I asked myself : 'Am I really living in the land of democracy today where those in authority have to take their politics from a handful of alien autocrates ?' (Hear, hear). When we arrived in this country we were asked not to represent the views which we had been sent to represent, but to chime in with the views and fancies of the autocrats in high quarters. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I decided that I would not 'moderate'--they are moderate enough in all conscience--the claims of our people, but to deliver the message with which we have been charged. I am not going to hurl our mandate at you; I am prepared to reason with you, to argue with you, to

explain to you as clearly as I can what is not clear, what is new, and what is on the fact of it startling, and I hope I may rely on the ancient English tradition of fair play and an open mind. (Cheers). Imperialists, exploiters, and people with axes to grind are leading up to a most serious situation in the British Empire. If you value the Empire you will give us a patient hearing, and carefully consider what we have to say. In certain quarters efforts have been made to belittle the Delegation. Ladies and gentlemen, I will tell you who we are and whom we represent. We have been sent to this country by the All India Khilafat Conference, the largest and most representative national body in India of recent times. The Indian National Congress and the Muslim League are large and important political bodies, but the body we represent is larger and more comprehensive than these. Twenty thousand Hindus and Mussulmans attended the third session of the All India Khilafat Conference that has sent this Delegation and its proceedings lasted from 6 o'clock in the evening to two next morning and I have never in my experience of Indian meetings seen anything like the enthusiasm that marked these proceedings. Then, consider for a moment the huge crowds that greeted my brother and myself on our release in the large cities like Delhi, Lahore, Amritsar, Meerut, Karachi, Bombay, Lucknow, Cawnpore, and Aligarh and that greeted my brother Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and the deportees of Amritsar and other victims of 'Special Tribunal Justice' when they visited Calcutta. The enthusiasm was visible in the smaller towns and villages of India that insisted on our visiting them and going through them in procession. Think of the enthusiasm exhibited by the people all along our route as we travelled to Bombay and while we were there, on our way to England. I wish Printing House Square was really as omniscient as it makes itself out to be. And what is happening now ? Telegrams of approbation have arrived from all over India, for example, one representing a great meeting of 15,000 in a comparatively small place like Chittagong, to mention only one. It is the people who have sent us here and not an unrepresentative officialdom. As to our antecedents, some of us have certainly suffered imprisonment without any kind of trial at all, but merely on the *lettres de cachet* of the executive, for purely religious activities, and, indeed, in India the law has been so administered that the best of men have been forced to regard imprisonment as an honour. Need I appeal in your country to your past history ? Have not the Pyms and Hampdens of England suffered to secure the liberties of which Englishmen are so proud ? I ask you, Englishmen and Englishwomen, not to deprive us also of the right to be heard on behalf of our people merely because your representatives in India deprived us of our liberties. (Cheers). Mr. Llyod George said in Downing Street last Friday that he had consulted representative Muslim opinion, and shown the greatest consideration and deference to your Indian fellow subjects. I should like to know whom the Government have heard. Not one of the seventy millions of Indian Mussulmans was represented at the Peace Conference. Lord Sinha, a personal friend

of mine, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, if not veneration, does not represent the mind of the India today. If the Government believes it has secured two sets of opinions from India, let it publish what the second unknown section has really said at the Peace Conference. The real voice of the India was stifled. When a man was thought likely to say something undesirable he was interned. Journals were suppressed, plants were threatened and no newspaper truly representing the views of Indian Mussulmans was allowed to exist. I can give the names of a dozen newspapers that had an average life of not more than six months, not because there was no reading public to appreciate their views, but because the reading public appreciated those views, only too well. They were shut out from province after province under the Indian D. O. R. A. and then came down the Sword of Democles, the Press Act, which was admittedly based on an Austrian model, if you please. My own English weekly, the *Comrade*, was thus suppressed, for the security that has to be given for 'good behaviour' at the very outset by every journalist for his paper and his Press, as if he was a confirmed criminal, was declared forfeited on account of the publication of an article that was being praised by the *Morning Post*, the *Daily Telegraph*, and the *New Statesman* here almost on the very day that the Order of forfeiture was issued in India. My Urdu Daily, the *Hamdard*, was strangled by the precensorship that was set up under D. O. R. A., although it had been praised for its excellent tone during the war by the same official that now killed it without the least previous warning. I mention these two only as typical instances, and not because I was singled out for such repression. The same policy was followed with regard to Muslim public men. They were interned under D. O. R. A., and even imprisoned. One of the leading and most respected religious authorities, one of the greatest religious divines, Maulana Mahomed Hasan Sahib, of the famous religious seminary of Deoband, which has been thoroughly intimidated into flabby submission to the powers that be, an old man of seventy had to leave India after our internment, because he feared he would be required to sign something in the name of religion, as so many others had been required. That his conscience entirely abhorred. He migrated to Mecca, the sanctuary where, at least, Muslim conscience expected to be safe from outrage and coercion. But although he escaped from India, he could not escape the demand that he feared. He naturally refused to comply and what was the result ? He was arrested in the very sanctuary of Islam through the Shareef and deported to Egypt.

Perhaps it was feared that the mere presence of an honest and consciencious man would cast its spell over the Egyptians; he was removed to Malta, and is still kept there in spite of the recent Royal Proclamation; and at one time complaints were heard that he and his party were underfed. I do not know whether the same treatment is continued or not, but I know this, that some sort of a conditional offer of release was made to him which was refused, in the words of Joseph, in the Chapter of the Quran of that name,

'O,Lord, prison is dearer to me than that to which they invite me'. The whole of Muslim India indignantly protests against such an outrage, and if his release is not ordered immediately, the consequences will be of the gravest nature.

My own internment and that of my brother resulted, on Mr. Montague's arrival in India, in a revival of the protests that had continually been made before, and he was deluged with about a hundred thousand telegrams, all received in a single day, demanding our release. I have already referred to the enthusiastic ovation that we received on our release after four years' internment and seven months' imprisonment. It would be very agreeable to us, indeed, if we could honestly regard all this as a personal tribute to us. But that we cannot. It is a tribute rather to the Khilafat, with which we expressed and promoted sympathy, as we were bound by our faith to do. If this is a matter of reproach in the estimation of the *Times*, all I can say is that to us and to our friends and relations it is, and will continue to be, a matter of pride. These are our 'irreproachable antecedents,' and this our 'unquestionable and high standing'. What is more, the very people whom the *Times* would credit with such antecedents and much standing are fully supporting us today, and men that cannot yet be called 'politically minded' are religious-minded enough to say to us. 'God bless you, and prosper you.'

We are therefore entitled to say that we represent the people of India on this question. Two of us have been journalists who assisted in voicing Indian opinion and have been sent here because we were not unfamiliar with British politics. But our people have sent along with us an Oriental scholar and divine of great eminence to represent the Ulema of India, since the issue, so far as we are concerned, is a religious one, and it was necessary to have adequate representation of religious bodies in India. More men would come with us but time was passing and it was decided to send the first batch at once. Others are shortly expected and many more would follow if the Indian claims can secure a hearing. So much for our credentials, although I should have thought that no question of this kind would arise after our cordial reception by His Excellency the Viceroy, whose Government facilitated our departure for Europe and America.

And now about the character of our Mission. We are sometimes asked why it is that we who are not Turks and have had no political or racial association with them, have come all this way to interest ourselves in the Turkish Settlement. But this is not going to be merely a Turkish settlement. We hold no brief for the Turks but are the advoctaes of Indian claims. We speak not for the Turks but speak for ourselves. And here I must explain the nature and scope of Islam which makes this not a Turkish but an Islamic question. Islam does not recognise geographical and racial barriers such as the nationalism of modern Europe has set up in the way of the human intercourse and the widest human sympathies. In a word, it is not national but super-national. We do not worship in the shrines of a nationalism that has for its creed 'My country, right or wrong.' (Cheers).

And, one would have thought that after this horrible war, in which human ingenuity was taxed to its farthest capacity to devise means, not for the preservation, but for the destruction of mankind, a war that was clearly the only logical conclusion of the cult of nationalism, it was time Europe ceased to worship this Moloch of modern Nationalism. To the Mussulmans of India, the Turk is not only a man, but a brother, and that not because he shares with us a common domicile or a common parentage—things that can and do distinguish breeds of dogs and horses from other breeds but because he shares with us a common outlook on life and common institutions, and laws that materialise that outlook and perpetuate the culture of Islam. (Cheers). The Turks and we are alike charged with a mission for the uplift of mankind and claim to be the heirs of all the ages and of all the Prophets. We may have hitherto failed in our mission, we may have betrayed the great Divine trust. But while you may condemn us and look down upon us, the mission that we have been charged with by Islam cannot be looked down upon and condemned. It is clear that I am no 'apologist' for Islam. There is nothing to 'apologise' for, and if we attempt an 'apology for Islam' we lose the entire case at once, If you will permit the use of the phrase in a friendly way, far from apologising for Islam we have to carry the war 'into the enemy's own country'. But what a war? Not a war of poison gas, or Dreadnoughts or Tanks or Howitzers, but a war of reason, of persuasion, of influencing you with whatever we have of nobility and goodness and charity, for the Quran lays it down clearly and emphatically that 'There is no compulsion in faith.' Well, ladies and gentlemen, I was explaining why it was that we are interested in this so-called Turkish Settlement. I have told you that Islam is supernational and not national, that the basis of Islamic sympathy is not a common domicile or common parentage, but a common outlook on life and common culture. And the embodiment of that common culture is the Khilafat. Islam is not a bundle of dogmas and doctrines that theologians plague humanity with. It is a complete scheme of life, a perfect code of right conduct and a comprehensive social polity as wide as the human race and in fact as wide as the entire creation. And it has two centres. The personal centre is the Khalifa and the local centre is the Island of Arabia, the Sanctuary of Islam, the Land of the Prophets. The Khalifa is the Commander of the Faithful and his commands must be obeyed by all Muslims so long, and so long only, as they are not at variance with the Commandments of God and the Traditions of His Prophet. But since there is to be no lacerating distinction between things temporal and things spiritual, the Khalifa is something more than a Pope and cannot be 'Vaticanised'. But he is also less than the Pope, for he is not infallible and in all matters in which Mussulmans cannot see eye to eye with him the final arbiter is Allah Himself and we must refer back to the Quran and the Traditions of the Prophet. We are not therefore at his mercy and human conscience is still free. In fact, if he persists in un-Islamic conduct we can depose him, and have deposed him more than once. But so long

as he orders only that which Islam demands we must support him. He and no other ruler is the Defender of our Faith. (Cheers).

And now a word about 'Temporal Power'. Since Islam is not a thing for Sundays and Sabbaths only, or for Fridays only, if you prefer that, the Khalifa is not there merely to repeat his beads. His chief function has always been the defence of our faith, and it would be curious indeed if, when Christian had apparently discarded the Sermon on the Mount from its political code, and it was not the meek that inherited the Kingdom of the Earth, Islam should be asked to defend itself by turning the left cheek to him who smote the right cheek. All that a Muslim is and all that a Muslim has, including physical prowess, are part of a Divine trust to be spent in serving God and carrying out His purposes, and no Mussulman can keep back anything required for the defence of Islam without gross betrayal of that Divine trust. If force ceased to be used in settling the affairs of mankind the Muslim would be the first to surrender his arms, and turn his sword and scimitar into a ploughshare. (Cheers). But what do we see to-day ? Viscount Bryce wants the Allies to use the argument of the 'Big Stick' against the Khilafat. It is true that he says Orientals can understand no other argument. Now, could that object being, a mere Oriental ask his Lordship what other argument he thinks the Occidental understands ? We shall say nothing about the Allies, and we are on less dangerous ground if we refer to Germans and Austrians and Bolsheviks. Are these not of the West, and what argument other than that of the 'Big Stick' did they understand ? Is Germany converted to the pursuit of peace by his Lordship's eloquence, or by the 'Bigger Stick' of the Allies ? (Laughter). Well, so long as there are your Bryces and your 'Big Sticks,' we, too, must have some sort of a stick for the defence of our faith, and to jeopardise at least the dominance of those that jeopardise the freedom of our conscience. (Cheers). That, and that alone, is the rationale of our main claim that the Khilafat should be preserved with adequate temporal power. (Cheers). But if you think you can please the Mussulmans of India by allowing the Turks to retain Constantinople in such a way that the Khalifa is worse than the Pope at the Vatican—the Pope at Avignon—and, in fact, worse, for he would be the prisoner of people of an alien race and faith, then, ladies and gentlemen, you know very little of Islam and the Mussulmans, or of India and the Indians. (Cheers). That affront shall never be tolerated, and if you think that by placarding the fact that Indian Muslim soldiers have been dragooned into this wretched business, you can make out that all this 'agitation' is 'fictitious' and 'factitious', then you will be compelling the Indian Muslim soldiery to disprove this lie in a manner that will be far too unambiguous for your tastes or for ours. Beware, beware. (Cheers).

The first claim of the Indian Mussulmans I have already stated. It is that the Khilafat should be preserved with temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faith, and the irreducible minimum that is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, while taking guarantees from Turkey

consistently with her independence and dignity as a Sovereign State for security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development of all races, Christian, Muslim, and Jew. This is not the best but by a long way the second best. We ask, after the remorseless spoliation of Turkey for centuries, which deprived her of territories in Europe and in Africa, including the 'shameless brigandages', in Tripoli, as it was characterised by the Allies of Italy themselves, are we not most moderate in claiming that the remnant of territory and power left to Turkey after the Balkan War should be left to her and to Islam? There was a time when the great statesmen of Europe and America, and particularly President Wilson, spoke as if a new heaven and a new earth were to be created after this war, and if the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine is an act of justice surely the restoration of the territories torn from Turkey in Europe and of Tripoli to the Arabs if not to the Turks and of Egypt to the Egyptians if not to the suzerain Power must be regarded as an act of bare justice. But we do not ask for that, though we are in hearty sympathy with the claim of our brethren in those parts for undisturbed self-determination. What we ask for is after all so little that people who used to insist on a two-keels-to-one standard cannot but regard as extremely moderate. The power of Germany is broken, while the Allies are still strong. Do they fear a Turkish menace as they used to fear a German menace? That is not thinkable. England may have lost a good many things, but surely she has not lost her sporting instinct, and she could not have lost her nerve to the extent of insisting on complete destruction of Turkey for her own safety. Not by such tremors are great Empires won and retained. (Cheers).

Our second claim is that the Island of Arabia, the fourth boundary being the Euphrates and the Tigris, should remain in exclusive Muslim control, and since it would be idle to suggest your handing over some other territory to the Khalifa, for the preservation of the Khilafat, that main claim of ours necessitates that this entire region which includes Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia should remain within the scheme of Ottoman Sovereignty. For the most part it is a barren tract, though even at this distance we can smell the oil that is attracting you to Mesopotamia as it attracted you to the Persian Gulf. The Holiest of Holies lies in an 'uncultivable valley'. But every grain of sand of that sacred soil is dearer to us than tons of gold, and we who claim to be the true successors of Abraham, of Moses and of Jesus—on all of whom be peace and God's benedictions—as we claim to be the successors of the Last of the Prophets—on whom be peace and God's benedictions—are charged with keeping this land safe for Theocracy and the worship of one God. Even if the Turks were to tolerate any form of non-Muslim control over any part of this region the Indian Mussulmans and Mussulmans of the rest of world would still have to fight and die for keeping the sanctity of this soil inviolate. But if you fear that India is vulnerable from the Persian Gulf the security that you seek does not lie in the military occupation of Mesopotamia but in trusting your own Indian fellow-subjects with arms and as the organisers of a National Militia,

As for the Arabs, who could have greater sympathy with them than the Mussulmans of the world. (Cheers). Was not our Prophet an Arab? Is not Arabic the language of the Quran and of the Traditions? Is it not towards Mecca that we turn our faces when we pray five times a day, and is it not in Medina—the Medina that gave asylum to the Prophet and his companions, and stood by his successor to the end—is not there that so many of us long to secure, if only a grave? (Cheers). No, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot expect us to believe that the Supreme Council and the Allies love the Arabs as much as we do. In fact, no Turk could claim from us the affection that is reserved for the people of the Prophet. But it is not a question of Arabs or Turks. It is a question of Islam—(Cheers)—and Islam is dearer to us than Arab or Turk, as it must be to Arab and Turk themselves. This question of Arab autonomy can well be left to Mussulmans themselves to settle, and I foresee no great difficulty in the realisation of our dream of a federation that will give the Arab all the freedom he needs or demands. Our third claim is that the Holy Places namely the three Sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines in Mesopotamia should remain in the custody and under the wardenship of the Khalifa himself. The claim with regard to the exclusive Muslim control of the Island of Arabia is based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, and this claim with regard to the Wardenship of the Holy Places rests on a series of injunctions to be found in the Quran and the Prophet's Traditions. If our loyalty has always been based on full and free recognition of our religious obligations, and cannot rest on any other basis, then we have every right to insist that the Khilafat shall be preserved, that there shall be no Christian mandate over any part of the Island of Arabia, and that the Khalifa shall remain, as before the war, the warden of the Holy Places. The Prime Minister claims that deference has been paid to Indian Muslim sentiments. But none has so far been paid to Muslim religious obligations, let alone Muslim sentiments. The only basis for the Prime Minister's claim seems to be that the Khalifa is to remain in Constantinople. But why is he to remain there? Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law and Sir Edward Carson alike stated clearly that there was no other alternative, and if Tsarist Russia had not gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies, it would have been the Tsar who would have reigned at Tsargrad or Constantinople, and not the Sultan-Khalifa that would have been allowed to remain in Istambol out of deference to Muslim wishes. But that is not all. Even now, the Khalifa is to remain there, because there he can be dealt with as a hostage always living in fear of Allied guns. So much for 'Deference to Muslim wishes.' So far, indeed, is this from the truth that we can safely contend that Indian Mussulmans have not even had a fair hearing. You suppress their papers and intern and imprison their leaders and even revered divines, and when this 'frightfulness' has gagged the rest, you claim that you have heard them carefully and patiently. (Cheers). Even now, we could not refer to the points raised by the Premier in his reply to us, for it would have

lengthened the interview beyond the hour allotted to it, and would have cut into the might. But what is a might when questions that may mean years and decades of misery and trouble if they are not properly solved ? What is a might after all, when today millions of people are passing sleepless nights waiting for one gleam of the rising sun of justice and equity after this horrible might of bloodshed and slaughter. (Cheers).

But you will say what of the Armenian massacres ? Ladies and gentlemen, I do not in the least overlook them. How can we who hold a brief for Islam, the religion of peace and persuasion, and overlook the horrors reported ? But this question has a whole history behind it. Why is it that we never heard of these massacres in Armenia before the last quarter of the last century ? Shall I tell you ? It was because Tsarist Russia was busy with massacre-mongering in other parts of Turkey—in the Balkans. It was only when the success of this great 'Camouflage' in the Balkans was achieved beyond the highest expectations of Tsarist Russia, that wanted a clear corridor from Petrograd to Peshawar, that Armenia was selected as the next stage on the journey. It is not sufficient to inquire into the fact of casualties. You must investigate when these 'massacres' began, why they did not begin earlier, who was interested in their commencement, what intrigues went on inside and outside, whether peaceful subjects were slaughtered in cold blood or rebels dealt with as rebels are dealt with everywhere, whether an unarmed docile population was being exterminated by regular troops, or armed bodies of people were fighting among themselves on equal terms and a vendetta has been going on right to this day. Is it not true that the Armenians claimed representation in the Peace Conference because they were belligerents ? Is it not even now being claimed for them that they assisted the Allies against their own Government and should be rewarded at its expense ? Is it not true that these massacres are always heard of whenever any decision is about to be taken by the Allies with regard to territorial adjustment, and do they not occur just where capitalists see an excellent harbour and Imperialists find an excellent route by which a military railway could traverse a difficult region ? I have no desire to prejudge the issue. But we have claimed, and we claim now, that for the first time an inquiry should take place into the entire question, that an impartial international commission should undertake it, and that the All India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented on this commission. Is that a demand for justice and truth or support of murderers ? We challenge an open and impartial inquiry, for without such an inquiry you could not convince one Mussulman and one Indian that your were not of the same mind today as you were when your Prime Minister, in proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby, characterised his campaign as the last and most triumphant of Crusades in which Great Britain won what the entire chivalry of Europe had failed to achieve in several centuries. It is not we who talk of Crusades but your Prime Minister.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is our claim, and we leave you to judge

whether it is a claim for perpetuating a system of Government by massacres or for justice and equity; whether we are disloyal people who threaten British rule or loyal people who have come only to warn the Government and the nation of the grave consequences of a bad peace, a peace that would be no peace, but would herald another and a longer, if not a bloodier war, for it would be a war of conscience and of creed. We do not want to threaten, and we are of one mind with Col. Wedgwood, whose speech in the Constantinople debate we had the privilege to hear when we went straight to the House of Commons on our arrival in London. We do believe that more can be got out of Englishmen by persuasion than by threats. But when he asks us what can we threaten with. I do not agree with him. It is clear that we cannot threaten you with powerful engines of war. But we can threaten you and do threaten you with the might of truth and with the weapon that no shield can resist, with an unconquerable will not to yield to injustice and inequity; with the will, in the last resort, to die. (Cheers). I have addressed the British nation through this audience. To His Majesty the King-Emperor, too, I have a message to deliver through you. And it is in the form of a question. Can he any longer rely on the allegiance of his Indian and Muslim subjects if they betray the allegiance they owe to a higher King, the King of Kings ? (Loud cheers). And would he like to rule over a nation of slaves and cowards such as we would be if we submitted to the kind of peace that is about to be concluded, or to rule over men and women who honoured their conscience as their king and brought to his august Throne the unbought submission of a free nation ? (Loud cheers).

Mr. Syed Hossain : I want to put this problem of Turkey, which is really the problem of the Khilafat, not from the direction of Constantinople, but Calcutta. The fact is that the Sultan of Turkey (besides being the temporal head of the Turkish Empire) happens also to be the Khalifa of the Islamic world. This may be an unfortunate responsibility. It may be that the claims of the Ottoman Sultans to the Khilafat may not be so satisfactory as some would like. I am prepared to concede all those academic difficulties. The more important thing is that seventy-five millions in British India today recognise the Sultan of Turkey as their Khalifa. We are up against realities; we have neither the time nor the inclination for academic discussions. If what I have stated is the case, how can we expect to continue loyal to the British Crown if we see England a party to the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, which is also the Khilafat ? (Cheers). Camouflage is a phrase that has come into universal popularity with the war, but its popularity has not ended with the war, and even now when we are supposed to be in the throes of the aftermath of the war, we find camouflage installed in the most exalted quarters—in Downing Street and elsewhere. But we have got past the stage of political claptrap. We have not come here as the agents of a political agitation. This is not a political affair at all. It is a religious question which goes deep down into Muslim society and Muslim life throughout the world,

and we as Muslims are not prepared to let the Khilafat go down unmourned, unhonoured and unsung. (Cheers). As regards the consequences, it is true it is not very much we can do in the ordinary sense. It has been asked : 'What can the Indian Mussulmans do? They are a disarmed population like the rest of their compatriots in India.' It is both very easy and cheap to put questions of that kind. Let me ask, supposing we can do nothing in the way of retaliation, even if we wanted to, is that the kind of foundation on which you propose to build up your great British Commonwealth—is it the whole sanction of my British allegiance that I can do nothing ? (Loud Cheers). Have the Statesmen of Europe, like the Bourbons of old, learned nothing and unlearnt nothing from the Armageddon ? Is that the last answer we can get from responsible Ministers and Statesmen in this country ?

Mr. Lloyd George is in Downing Street today, but he may not be there tomorrow. The British Empire, I am glad to say, is independent of Mr. Lloyd George's tenure of 10, Downing Street. The British Empire has to be continued by the people, and it is before the great British people that we lay our question of conscience. It is not a question of political bargaining. It is not a question of sentimental consideration for the Turk or the Indian. It is keeping alive the faith of Islam, which we are not prepared to let die. (Cheers).

As you are aware we went to see Mr. Lloyd George the other day. The whole Muslim case was presented to him with 'very great lucidity and moderation.' Unhappily, neither the lucidity nor the moderation with which he credited us was reflected in his reply. We are concerned only to advance one ground and that is that Turkey cannot be torn into fragments like Germany and Austria, because the day you tear the Empire of the Khilafat to fragments you outrage the feelings of seventy-five millions of your own people. That is where the principle of self determination comes in. (Cheers). I do not know how this controversy may have to be fought out in its later stages. Certainly, so far as Mr. Lloyd George's reply is concerned it offers no way out. I want to remain a loyal subject of the British Crown, but I can only do so on this basis, that I shall have, as heretofore, complete religious freedom, that I shall be allowed to call my soul my own. (Cheers).

Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi next briefly addressed the meeting in Hindustani, and said he represented a class that had never been identified with secular agitations of any sort of kind, and he had come to this country not to profit by seeing its architectural, its historic and national treasures but to add to the voice of his colleagues in matter of religion which was one of life and death for the Mussulmans of the world. (Cheers).

Mr. Leland Buxton : I have been given five minutes to speak, and all I wish to say is to add my protest against the policy of setting a Greek Empire in the near East. (Hear, hear). I regard Greek Imperialism as the greatest danger to the peace in that part of the world. Its ambitions are as unbounded as its methods are barbarous and unscrupulous. I should like

to point out the fallacy underlying the remark of the Prime Minister that the Mussulmans in Thrace were a minority of the population. That was obviously untrue, because in the whole of Thrace they are in a very large majority. But assuming figures were correct, according to Greek statistics the Mussulmans and Bulgarians combined out number the Greeks Therefore, to hand over Eastern Thrace to the Greeks would mean transferring the population to the rule of their worst enemies. I hope our Indian friends will point out to the Prime Minister the misleading nature of his remarks. You may be quite sure that if the Greeks get Eastern Thrace, M. Venezelos will bring forward arguments for securing Western Thrace, too. I am astonished sometimes at the moderation of the Greeks, for I have not yet heard that they have yet laid claim to the city of Manchester, seeing the large number of Greeks who lived there. (Loud laughter). I was glad to learn that a section of the Labour Party is associated with this meeting. It confirms my view that Labour takes a wider vision on foreign polity than either Liberalism or Conservatism.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu : I scarcely require five minutes to say what I am privileged to say in the name of the great community of Hindu men and women I represent to-night. We reiterate the pledge to stand to death by the Mussulmans of India. (Cheers). If the great historic Empire of the Khilafat is to find a tomb in the chaos of the victories of the Allies, then the Allies shall also have to find a tomb for the compatriots of the Islamic faith. We Hindus are a people who have been pledged through all the centuries to maintain the Dharma - our natural and spiritual righteousness. When millions of our compatriots are threatened with the destiny which is worse than death, we cannot stand aside and let them die without companionship. (Cheers).

Can the British people who boast that their Government is broad based upon the people's will, stand by and see this mockery of justice ? (Cries of 'No'). Can you not see that you are false to your great traditions of liberty ? Can you stand aside and let a great Empire perish, when out of that Empire you would build new territorial powers and principalities ? You talk of self-determination and freedom, but we talk of self-determination, too. Shall there be one law for the Christian and another law for the non-Christian ? If the Empire of the Khilafat is to be broken, let it be broken, so long as all other Empires are broken. On the ruins of broken Empires are established the democracies of the world. (Cheers).

Mr. M. T. Kaderbhoy : I feel highly inspired by the poetic eloquence of Mrs. Naidu delivered here in defence of Islam, and I am sure that Muslim brethren feel happy and grateful at the magnificent oration of our dear Hindu sister to-night.

It is necessary for me to submit for the information of this meeting (as I am deputed to do so) that 'a mass meeting of the Mussulmans of Bombay was held under the auspices of the Anjumane-Zia-ul-Islam, where it was

unanimously resolved that Mussulman Khilafat Delegation, headed by Moulana Mohamed Ali, was not only the recipient of our entire approbation, but our sincerest prayers in the fulfilment of its sacred mission with regard to the question of Khilafat. It was also further resolved that special prayers be offered every Friday for the welfare and security of the members. So you see from this above resolution that the Delegation was not only representative in its character, but was also composed of such worthy and noble sons of Islam as to cause anxiety in the minds of the Muslims with regard to the safety of its members. This is the slap from Bombay to the Printing House Square and the '*Times*' for its amazing impudence. (Cheers).

After the illuminating and stirring addresses given to you this evening by the distinguished and worthy son of Islam, Mr. Mohamed Ali, and his co-delegates, with regard to the question of Khilafat—a question in which not only the Mussulmans of India, numbering more than seventy millions, but the whole world of Islam is so vitally interested that the natives of this country and Christian Europe can hardly realise its gravity and magnitude—it is not necessary for me to dilate upon it. Suffice is to say that I take my stand on the words of the Persian poet, who says : 'Arrogance, haughtiness and self-usurpation consigned the Arch-Devil to the eternal fury of Hell.'

Every Mussulman lives and dies for his religion, and not like a Christian, that the religion lives for him, as the Archbishop of Canterbury, drawing £ 15,000 a year, living in a grand mansion and in a grand manner, wants the religion to live for him. That was not the message left by Christian (May the blessings of God be upon him)- but materialistic Europe has exploited the religion in this fashion, whereas in the case of Mussulmans the aspect is spiritual and the spirit divine.

The whole world is passing through a crisis unparalleled in history, and we, Muslims, have been undergoing a terrible ordeal since the declaration of the war with Turkey and the threatened partition of the Turkish Empire against the wishes of the Muslims of India. If Britain partitions the Turkish Empire she will partition her own Empire. (Cheers).

Mr. I. M. Parikh : I have the honour of representing the Executive of the Indian National Congress in this country. I am their Secretary, and I may say that the Congress, as a body, is in sympathy with the Delegation. Indeed, the whole of India is united on this question. Belief in religion is not a matter of argument. It is a question of faith. We must stand to a man and to a woman with our fellow-countrymen and see that their religion is saved. (Cheers).

Mr. Arnold Lupton : The wisest thing that can be done is to leave the Ottoman Empire alone. (Hear, hear). The Ottoman are no worse than other men. I do not know that they are better. It would be impossible for them to be worse than we are, (Laughter). Do not misunderstand me. The English are the best and cleverest people in the world; I also think some of them are the

wickedest. The Ottomans have offered us their hand. They have asked us to help them. They are not too proud to take our assistance. We have fought each other, now let us try and work and trade together and advance the common good. Let us remember we are all the children of one great Father, and help each other. We must save the people of Constantinople from the starvation which threatens them, and we must save the Turks all over Asia from a similar fate. We must act now. In a short time it may be too late. We must try to make peace with the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, and go hand-in-hand with them in the march of progress. (Cheers).

Mr. Abdul Majid : I have very much pleasure in moving a vote of thanks to the members of the Delegation.

Mr. B. G. Horniman : I beg to second, and only wish to say that no Delegation has ever come to this country from India with stronger credentials than. Mr. Mohamed Ali and his colleagues, and I am convinced that if Mr. Lloyd George had as large a claim to represent the mind of England as the Delegation have to represent the mind of India, we should have had a very different reply from that which he gave the Delegation on Friday last. (Hear, hear, and cheers).

The meeting, which was enthusiastic throughout then closed.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

67

THE KHILAFAT HARTAL

CALCUTTA, 20 March 1920 (delayed)

The Khilafat 'hartal' (day of fasting, prayer, and cessation of work) passed off quietly throughout Calcutta. The disturbances in the mill district were confined to one mill, and the demonstrators dispersed on the arrival of a subdivisional officer.

At a meeting in Bombay at night Mr. Gandhi moved a resolution trusting that not only would His Majesty's Ministers who desired the retention of India within the Empire dissociate themselves from the 'irresponsible' anti-Turk agitation in Great Britain, but would secure a settlement of the Khilafat question compatible with the religious sentiments of the Muslims, adding that any other solution must result in a complete withdrawal of co-operation from the Government, and finally that the Muslims reserve the right of taking such steps as the exigencies of the situation dictate. He said some Mahommedans had insisted on the last clause, which meant that if non-violence failed to

achieve their end they should be at liberty to resort to the other methods enjoined on them by the Quran. These were that they should leave the country in which their religion was assailed, or go to war against the assailant. Thus the resolution foreshadowed in an unmistakable manner that the last stage of this Khilafat movement would be a bloody revolution. God forbid that the country should pass through such horrors, but feeling on the question ran so high that an unsatisfactory solution of the Turkish question might land India in a revolutionary movement the might of which had not been seen before.

—*Daily Telegraph* 26 March 1920.

BOMBAY, 21 March 1920 (delayed)

The second day of the Muslim hartal (suspension of business to mourn) passed without disturbance, except some very slight trouble on the outskirts of Calcutta. The day was observed as a general day of mourning by the Muslims, many Hindus joining them with public meetings, praying for a settlement in accordance with Muslim sentiments on the Khilafat.

The significance of this hartal is that it was a direct rejoinder to the statements of Lord Bryce that Indian Muslims generally were indifferent to the fate of Turkey. I invite attention to the special note in the Bombay resolution passed on the motion of Mr. Gandhi, which says that the settlement is not consonant with Indian sentiment and must induce a complete withdrawal of co-operation with the Government. The advanced wing of the Muslims are now trying to rush the Khilafat movement to the point of a Jehad. Nothing but confidence in Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montague would have averted an explosion. It is reported that Mr. Gandhi is proceeding to England on the question.

—*Times*, 26 March 1920.

GRAVE SITUATION IN INDIA

The Islamic Information Bureau received the following telegrams on 27 March 1920 :

MADRAS, 20 March 1920

Hindu and Muslim citizens of Madras assembled in tens of thousands on the second Khilafat Day appeal to the Peace Conference through the British Government, which is playing the most predominant part in its counsels, with all the earnestness and religious fervour that the Eastern people are capable of, to conclude peace with Turkey on terms that will fully ensure the integrity of Turkey and the suzerainty of the Sultan-Khalifa over the Federated Autonomous Muslim States of Arabia, Syria, including Palestine and Mesopotamia. No other settlement, in the opinion of the meeting, will preserve that amount of prestige, power, and independence for the Khalifa, who is, according to the religion of Islam, absolutely essential for the universally revered guardian and custodian of the Holy Places, and will not therefore, satisfy the Mussul-

mans of India and of the world. This meeting earnestly begs the Peace Conference not to allow short-sighted racial and religious prejudice of the Allied nations to influence its decision, and that no unfair advantage should be taken of the defeat of Turkey, brought about mainly with Indian arms to secure the ends, which a hundred years of crusades and five hundred years of warfare with Turkey failed to achieve for Christianity and Europe. Any decision of the Conference that betrays the trust and confidence of Eastern nations in the bonafide and high aims of the Allies would bring about an unprecedented upheaval throughout Asia and Africa, and would jeoparadise the peace of the world generally, and the external and internal peace of India, and would strain the patience and loyalty of Indian Mussulmans especially in its present most critical moment.

This meeting considers the delay in the Turkish settlement mainly responsible for the outburst of racial disturbances in Turkey, leading, among other untoward consequencee, to internecine troubles, and, while condemning the massacres of Mussulmans and Christians, and demanding an impartial and independent inquiry into them, this meeting strongly urges that these unfortunate happenings should not be allowed to cloud the real issues, and prejudice the case of Turkey, which is the case of the whole of Islam in which non-Muslim Oriental races actuated by primeval self-preserving instincts are equally and alarmingly interested.

—Moulvi Ziyauddin Mohammad, President.

BOMBAY, 12 March 1920 (delayed)

The agitation in England for the expulsion of the Turks from Constantinople has caused in India a profound feeling which is daily gathering in force. It is distressing to non-Muslims here that after the splendidly loyal refusal of the Indian Mahommedans to allow their religious feelings to disturb their political and military co-operation with the Empire during the war, the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Christian Ministers should now fan an anti-Muslim crusade. The joint pronouncement by the Chairman of the Bombay and Calcutta Chambers of Commerce, disassociating themselves from the movement, may be truly regarded as generally representing English sentiment here, and a Christian missionary who has recently travelled in all parts of India writes to the Press to-day declaring that Christians in India feel that the origin of the war was not religious, nor would the settlement be. *The Times of India,* in ressuring Mahommedans regarding the 'pernicious propaganda by fanatical prelates' and 'the even more perverse Lord Bryce', declares that non-Muslims unite with their Muslim fellow-citizens in regarding the full observance of the Premier's pledge as essential to British honour.

Meanwhile the Hindus are making common cause with the Muslims in the counter-agitation. A conference of all the parties will be held at Bombay on March 19. His Highness the Aga Khan, in a long speech reported today, says this is the most serious political situation in the history of India, and is

so serious that it has become an Indian national question. There are possibilities that the Turks may be exterminated as a race, and we must try to assure a solution that will prevent more bloodshed between the Turks and Arabs. There is great need for educating English public opinion, for in England the opposite party spends millions of pounds in cinemas showing the terrible things said to have happened in Armenia, but with pictures taken in California : A sum of £ 14,000 was subscribed at the meeting.

DELHI, 17 March 1920 (delayed)

The future of Turkey continues to exercise Muslim minds. Meetings to discuss the matter are constantly being held, and memorials on the subject continue to flow in. Reuter. —*Daily Telegraph*, 25 March 1920.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

68

SYED SULAIMAN NADVI ON KHILAFAT AND THE TRIBE OF QURAISH

The question of the preservation of an *Imamat* or Khilafat is one on which all the different sects in Islam are agreed and unanimous and the contention of Professor Nallino, of the University of Rome, that 'Sunnite Islamism have never admitted a supreme head of the Islamic Church' is not tenable on any ground whatsoever. In fact it is not tenable even for Shiahs. All books of Muslim theology and jurisprudence insist on the continued existence of the Khilafat or *Imamat* as essential to, and as a cardinal principle of faith. It is clearly laid down that 'the establishment of the Imamat is one of the chief doctrines of the Muslim faith and polity'. It would be unnecessary to give any more quotations to establish this point which, although not admitted by Professor Nallino, is admitted by the scholars of Arabic in this country.

There is, however, another and a more important contention that demands careful investigation. It is alleged that the Prophet said that 'the Imam should be of the tribe of Quraish.' This Tradition is brought forward with great solemnity and efforts are made to make a great deal of political capital out of it. The Orientalists in this country think that they can, by the mere mention of this Tradition, gag the Mussulmans and defeat the claim of the entire Sunni world of Islam that the Sultan of Turkey is the rightful and legitimate Khalifa of Islam. These so-called scholars of Arabic are in blissful

ignorance of the fact that the saying just quoted was not uttered by the Holy Prophet but is of the first Khalifa, Abu Bakr; and at a time when the tribe of Quraish wielded supreme and unquestioned authority among the Arabs. On the demise of the Prophet, when some differences arose among the Companions with regard to the choice of a successor of the Prophet as the Commander of the Faithful, and leader of the Mussulmans, and when the people of the Medina laid claim to the Khilafat for a Medinite; Abu Bakr said, 'O, People of Medina, do you not know in what high esteem the tribe of Quraish is held by whole of the Arabia ?' This statement of Abu Bakr's is to be found in all authoritative books of Tradition. If the Khilafat were exclusively reserved for the tribe of Quraish, the Holy Prophet would not have observed that 'I would have appointed Ibn-i-Umm-i-Abd, as my successor if the Khalifa could be appointed without consultation of the people.' This is a Tradition reported by *Trimidi*. The same collection contains another saying of the Prophet that 'the Quraish will retain the Khilafat so long as they uphold and maintain the faith; otherwise it will pass on to others.' It has further been reported by Ahmed that the Prophet said : 'If Abu Obeidah be alive at the time of my death I will nominate him to be the Khalifa, otherwise Muaz ibn-i-Jabal will be nominated for the Khilafat.' None of these Companions was of the tribe of the Quraish. Omar, the second Khalifa, and one of the most renowned figures in the history of Islam, is reported to have said : 'If Salim, the manumitted slave of Abu Husaifa, were living, I would not have given precedence to any other over him.' *Sharh-i-Maqasid*, one of the most notable books on Muslim Theology, contains the following saying of the great Imam Razi, the Rhazes of Europe : 'Khilafat is the temporal and religious headship of Islam which can be bestowed upon any Mussulman.' The *Sharh-i-Maqasid*, the *Sharh-i-Mawaqif*, the *Musamara*, and other books of authority most unambiguously lay it down that 'in the absence of a sufficiently powerful and strong personality belonging to the tribe of Quraish even a non-Arab can lawfully become the Khalifa.'

To assert that the Sultan of Turkey is not the porper Khalifa would be to ignore the clearest admissions of Christian and European historians of Islam themselves who flourished not so long ago. The concluding statements in Muir's '*Caliphate*', a book regarded by Professor Margoliouth as of great authority proves the statement made above. But why go to musty books and authors long departed ? Even today we can get conclusive proofs on the point in every mosque every Friday, where, in supplications to Allah for the protection of Islam and the Commander of the Faithful, the present Sultan of Turkey is clearly designated the Khalifa and Defender of the Faith. An Armenian writer has contributed an article entitled, 'The Sultan is not the Caliph', to the *New Europe*. He affirms, on the authority of a disconnected phrase of Ibn-i-Khaladun, and an unknown book on the principles of the Islamic Faith, said to have been printed in Delhi, that it is essential for a Khalifa to be of Quraish. I wish the writer had quoted Ibn-i-Khaladun in extenso,

because the reader would then have found that a little further on the same famous author states that Khilafat is in no sense exclusive to the Quraish. It is a literary crime to try to establish one's contentions by wrenching incomplete statements from their context and quoting disconnected passages from great authorities only to misrepresent them.

But the important fact is that an essential institution such as the Khilafat does not rest on any technicalities that have to be rescued by interested parties from a dusty herbarium and garnished up afresh with half-truths and untruths. Islam is a complete synthesis, a perfect whole, and entire unit, combining things spiritual and things temporal, and it has for its central figure the person and office of the Khalifa who must have adequate temporal power to defend the Faith and the Faithful and prevent the outraging of Muslim conscience in every region. The ideal arrangement is the choice of the most pious Mussulman and the concentration of the all power in his hands, as the head of the Islamic Theocracy, which is a true Republic. This ideal was materialised in the Khilafat of the first four Khalifas, known as 'the Truly Guided Khalifas.' But even then practical considerations led the Companions of the Prophet to select one of the tribe of the Quraish so that he could control that powerful tribe and lead it 'in the Path of Allah'.

Later the Omayyide kings were accepted as Khalifas because they had the greatest power and willingly placed it at the disposal of the Faith for its defence. Abbaside kings succeeded them and were for similar reasons accepted as the Khalifas. The Mamelukes could well have claimed the Khilafat for the same reasons, after 1258 when Baghdad was sacked; but instead of that they retained the scions of the Abbasides as Khalifas and acknowledged them alongwith the rest of the Islamic world. When the Sultan of Turkey conquered Egypt he was clearly marked out for the Khilafat, and would have been accepted without any further formalities if the world of Islam agreed. But he fortified his position by an act of cession and the Khilafat was transferred to him with the consent of the Islamic world without bitter controversy or bloodshed.

In other words, for the same reason that Abu Bakr, recognising the force of circumstances, asserted that the Khalifa should then be of the tribe of Quraish, the Muslim world for four centuries has asserted, without contradiction, that the Khalifa should now be the head of the Ottoman Empire. The saying of Abu Bakr is an incontrovertible argument for the preservation of the temporal power of the Khilafat, and cannot be used as an excuse for narrowing down the choice of the Muslim Republic to members of a particular tribe, which is entirely at variance with the spirit of Islam, as we understand it. Far more rational would be the total denial of that choice and the substitution of a direct hereditary succession which the Shiah persuasion claims.

But, in any case, it does not lie in the mouth of anyone in this country to deny the title of the Sultan of Turkey to the Khilafat, when the Earl of Mornington, afterwards the Marquis of Wellesley, Governor-General of India,

sought and obtained the assistance of the Ottoman Khalifa at a critical moment in the history of British expansion in India, and addressed to Tipu Sultan on 16 January 1799, a letter in which he exhorted the latter to cut off all connection with Napoleon and the French, and buttressed his own arguments with a letter addressed to Tipu Sultan by Sultan Selim dated Constantinople, 20 September 1798, and delivered to Mr. Spencer Smith, his Britannic Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary, etc. The Governor-General refers to this letter of Sultan Selim as an exhortation to Tipu 'to manifest your zeal for the Mussulman faith, by renouncing all intercourse with the common enemy of every religion, and the aggressor of the Head of the Mahommedan Church', and expresses the hope that 'when your discerning mind shall have duly examined this respected letter, you will no doubt draw the following conclusion from it....'

'Secondly, that the French have insulted and assaulted the acknowledged Head of the Mahommedan Church; and that they have wantonly raised an unprovoked and cruel war in the heart of the country which is revered by every Mussulman as the repository of the most sacred Monuments of the Mahommedan Faith.'

Is it too much to expect that the English would still regard the Ottoman Sultan as the 'acknowledged Head of the Mahommedan Church,' and themselves spare what their Governor-General regarded as 'the heart of the country which is revered by every Mussulman as the repository of the most sacred Monuments of the Mahommedan Faith' ? Mussulmans still acknowledge the Sultan as the Head of their Theocracy and revere the country which is still the repository of the Most Sacred Monuments of their Faith. The lapse of a century and a quarter has added force to the prescription of the centuries that had gone before and endeared all the more both the Khalifa and the Khilafat to hundreds of millions of Mussulmans all the world over.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

69

LETTER FROM MOHAMED ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY TELEGRAPH

I regret to have to say that the speech which I made at the Working Mosque on Sunday afternoon has been summarised in a manner that makes it appear as if I held out threats, which is just what I did not. Knowing some thing of the difficulty of summarising within very restricted space long

speeches on unfamiliar subjects, I can well sympathize with your correspondent. But it is unfortunate that in summarising my speech he has made the report in parts inaccurate, and generally rather misleading. I repeat what I said to Mr. Fisher, and more recently to Mr. Lloyd George, that we are here on a mission of peace and reconciliation, and not to hold out threats, and I think both these Ministers have acknowledged our moderation. The only threat that I did hold out was that Islam would certainly crush, by the weapons of truth and reason, those that may seek to crush it today with the weapons of temporal power, just as it crushed ultimately who sacked Baghdad in 1258, and the vanquished ultimately became the victor. It is the miracle of Islam that to-day Mussulmans all the world over are striving to preserve the Khilafat of the descendants of those very people that had in their own estimation finally crushed the Khilafat nearly seven centuries ago.

But while holding out no other threat than this, we are certainly here to convey to those that wield authority or influence the most serious warning that ever a body of men was charged with conveying, and it is not idle talk or bluff when we say that England could no longer count on the support of a single believing Muslim if a settlement with Turkey was made regardless of the most binding religious obligations of Mussulmans. Our loyalty has always been strictly conditioned by regard for our Faith, and it is because we are not disloyal, and do not wantonly desire to break away from England, that we have come all this way to state and explain our religious obligations, which we did to a large body of English Mussulmans, as well as others, at working. May it be given to us to use the weapons of persuasion and reason wisely and well so as to help in restoring the sway of peace over mankind.

Source: Daily Telegraph, March 1920.

70

LETTER FROM H. M. HAYAT, SECRETARY TO THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION, TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

26 March 1920

I am desired by the Indian Khilafat Delegation to request you to be good enough to arrange that the Delegation may be received by the Supreme Council now engaged in drawing up a scheme for the settlement with Turkey, before its work is over, so that the Delegation may explain the Muslim point of view with regard to the settlement, stating the obligations imposed on Mussulmans by their faith and giving expression to the over-

whelming sentiment of Indian Mussulmans and the ardent sympathies of their compatriots of other faiths, who are at one with them in this matter.

I am to invite your attention to the following passage in the Address presented by the Deputation of the All India Khilafat Conference to the Viceroy and Governor-General of India at Delhi, on January 19, last, when they waited upon His Excellency :

> And, since we have been repeatedly asked to remember that in arranging such a settlement Great Britain, whatever her position among her Allies and Associates, could not leave their interests and wishes out of consideration, we trust that our Deputation, that is to say, the Indian Khilafat Delegation, will be enabled to explain to the Allied and Associated Nations and their Governments the nature and binding force of Islamic obligations, and the true character and scope of Muslim aspiration.

I am to say that cables received from India in large numbers with regard to the total suspension of business by all communities throughout India, on the 19th instant, involving a loss of millions of pounds, and the meetings of protest held all over of country, indicate that the situation, far from improving since the Delegation sailed from India, has undergone a change distinctly for the worse and the Delegation trust that they will be able to impress the Supreme Council not only with the reasonableness of the Indian claims, but also with the grave and extremely unfortunate consequences to the peace of the world of a settlement that does not respect the religious obligations of Mussulmans on which their loyalty to their secular rulers has always been based. In the words of the Address to which I have referred above, their desire to lay before the Supreme Council a full and clear statement of the position in India and the East generally 'would have been both natural and laudable at any time; but in view of the grave situation that exists to-day and is fast developing into an unmistakable menace, it has acquired an urgency and an insistence that have compelled us to give respectful expression to it through the head of His Majesty's Government.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

71

LETTER FROM AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR, THE TIMES

8 April 1920

If anything was needed to enforce the demand for an investigation into the deplorable incidents in Cilicia it is furnished by the ghastly story

published in the '*Times*' of the 19th instant, under the very judicial heading, 'Armenians Accused of Massacres'. The statements are circumstantial, and evidence in support of the charges appears to have been placed before the British High Commissioner and the American representative in Transcaucasia; but so far they have gone without notice. I did not suppose that the horrors would be filmed; but I certainly did expect some expressions of disapproval, as humanity demanded. And, in view of the disastrous reaction that has been set up in India by the ill-advised agitation in respect of Constantinople, a wise policy invited reprobation. This reaction in India will not be mitigated by the amazing demands of the Armenian Patriarch, published in the *Times* of March 23. The hideous story from Azerbajan proves one fact, that our Armenian friends and proteges are not above committing atrocities as ferocious as they impute to others. As for manipulating public opinion, they have only one rival. It has become more than essential, in order to preserve the ideal of the British code of justice, to have a thorough and impartial investigation into these deplorable incidents, not only where the Eastern Christians are the accused, but also where they are the accusers. If I understand aright the national conscience of England, and 50 years' experience gives me some knowledge, it would revolt at the idea of passing sentence before or without trial. In the present state of chaos in Asia Minor, due to a variety of circumstances to which it is unnecessary to refer, crimes provoked by one side or the other will occur. England with her great power and splendid organisation, has not succeeded in stopping atrocities in Ireland; and in India riots attended by 'massacres' are ordinary occurrences; the outburst of frenzy in Behar and in Katarpur happened only a short time ago. The application of outside force, the policy of the 'Big Stick', has the fatal tendency to move in a vicious circle; it involves the necessity of continual application of force; resulting in inevitable reaction and unrest. Is the British nation, with its strong common sense, prepared to sanction the maintenance of another large army of occupation or employing other forces to keep the Near East in order ?

May I again venture to urge, with all the strength I possess, that what Western Asia needs now, and needs acutely, is the appeasement of the discord and strife which have kept its varied communities so long at each other's throats ? But the bewildering report that Greece has laid an order in the Canadian wool market for over 10,00,000 yards of Khaki, deliverable in June, is not exactly calculated to inspire hopes of peace in that distracted part of the world.

***Source* : The Times, London, April 1920.**

72

LETTER FROM H. M. HAYAT, SECRETARY TO THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

9 April 1920

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a letter addressed to me by the British Secretary, Supreme Council, dated the 7th instant, in reply to the request which I had the honour to address to you, that the Indian Khilafat Delegation may be given an opportunity of expressing their views before the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference.

I am directed by the Delegation to say that they note that the Peace Conference has made a rule 'not to hear any one except the accredited Governments of territories witl. whose future they are dealing', and that 'the Supreme Council has already heard the official Delegation of India.' They, however, desire me to state that the cases of the Mussulmans of the world, and of the accredited national delegation of India stand on so different a footing from those covered by the rule that the Delegation hope the Supreme Council would reconsider its decision.

I am to say that the Turkish Settlement, involving as it does the question of the Khilafat, in the preservation of which the Mussulmans of the world are so vitally interested, does not obviously seem to be a question on which the Peace Conference should hear only the Governments of territories with whose future they are dealing. In fact, that the concern of the Muslim world for the future of Khilafat, which is the most essential institution of Islam transcends in importance the interests of the various Governments that are being set up in different parts of the Khilafat territories.

A concern that is so vital, and affects so large a portion of humanity, inhabiting several continents, and that arises from a feeling deeper than patriotism, and yet not territorial in its essence, cannot, in view of the Delegation, be ignored by the Peace Conference in arranging a settlement of the world's affairs to which it attached any degree of finality, and by means of which it hopes to restore once more the sway of Peace over mankind.

With reference to the official Delegation of India, which the Supreme Council has already heard, the Indian Khilafat Delegation would invite the attention of the Council to the fact, that so far at least, the State and the nation are not one in India, and the Delegation submit that a nation numbering more than 315 millions of people is entitled to a hearing before a final decision is taken on a question that has incontestably acquired a national status.

The Delegation hope that they may, without any disrespect to the

members comprising the official Delegation of India also refer to the fact that no Indian Mussulman was represented on the Delegation in spite of Muslim protests, since the Indian Khilafat Delegation are here to urge a full and fair consideration of the religious obligations of the Mussulmans who acknowledge His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey as the successor of the Prophet, and Commander of the Faithful, and have been deputed by the Indian nation to represent its views before the Peace Conference, the Delegation hope that the Supreme Council will enable them to explain these obligations and views. If an opportunity such as they desire is not given them, it is likely to create a sense of injustice in the vast populations that are vitally interested in the success of the mission of peace and reconciliation with which the Delegation has been charged. This will defeat the purpose of the Peace Conference itself, which must obviously be to reconcile its decisions to the conscience of mankind.

I am to invite your attention once more to the gravity of the situation in India and the East generally, and the Delegation would beg you, both in the interests of justice and of tranquillity in the Indian Empire, to give to their request your most earnest consideration. They hope that they may say without offence, that apparently the gravity of the situation is not so fully appreciated on this as, on account of their more intimate knowledge of India, they themselves appreciate.

They, however, hope that you will pardon this apparent importunity because it arises out of nothing beyond their anxiety to reconcile their loyalty to His Majesty the Emperor of India, and their fervent desire for the restoration of peace in Asia.

If, as the Delegation fear, the Supreme Council is not likely to arrive at a decision with regard to the request at a very early date, I am to say that they would greatly value another opportunity of placing their views before you.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

73

LETTER FROM M. P. A. HANKEY, BRITISH SECRETARY, SUPREME COUNCIL TO THE SECRETARY, KHILAFAT DELEGATION

20 April 1920

I am directed by Mr. Llyod George to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 9th asking that the Indian Khilafat Delegation may be given

an opportunity of expressing their views before the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference.

In reply I am directed to confirm my telegram of even date stating that the Supreme Council have considered your letter and are unable to reconsider the decision conveyed in my letter of April 7th.

With reference to the last paragraph of your letter I am directed to state that as the main questions relating to the Treaty of Peace with Turkey have now been decided the Prime Minister does not think that any useful purpose will be served by a fresh hearing of your Delegation.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

74

TELEGRAM SENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION FROM PARIS, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ALLIES AT SAN REMO

20 April 1920

'The Indian Khilafat Delegation representing seventy millions of Mussulmans in India and two hundred and fifty millions of their compatriots of other faiths who ardently sympathise with and support them, consider it their duty, not only to their co-religionists and fellow-countrymen, but also to all desirous of establishing permanent peace in the world, to urge upon the Supreme Council, at this critical juncture, not to disregard the religious obligations imposed by their faith on the Mussulmans of the entire world, and the overwhelming national sentiment of India, with regard to the Khilafat and the Turkish Settlement. The mandate which our Delegation have been charged to lay before the Governments and peoples of the Allied and Associated Powers has already been submitted and explained in detail to the British and French Governments, but, unfortunately, it has not been possible for us through unavoidable circumstances, to present our case to the Italian and Japanese Governments. In view, however, of the fact that the Supreme Council is now meeting at San Remo and dealing with the Turkish Settlement, the Delegation feel it their duty respectfully to convey to the Supreme Council the chief items of the Muslim mandate.

Firstly, the Mussulmans of India, in common with the vast majority of their co-religionists throughout the world, ask that in as much as independent temporal sovereignty with its concomitants of adequate military and economic resources is of the essence of the institution of the Khilafat the Empire of the

Khalifa shall not be dismembered under any pretext. As the Sultan of Turkey is recognised by the vast majority of Mussulmans as Khalifa, what is desired is that the fabric of the Ottoman Empire shall be maintained intact territorially on the basis of the *status quo ante bellum*. But without prejudice to such political changes as give all necessary guarantees consistent with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign State for the security of life and property and opportunities of full autonomous development for all the non-Turkish communities, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, comprised within the Turkish Empire. But on no account is a Muslim majority to be placed under the rule of the non-Muslim majority contrary to the principle of self-determination. In behalf of this claim, the Delegation draw the attention of the Supreme Council to (1) the Declaration of the British Prime Minister, equally binding on all the Allied and Associated Powers, when on January 5, 1918 he said : 'Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominatingly Turkish in race', and (2) to President Wilson's twelfth point in his message to the Congress, dated January 8, 1918 on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was signed, and which required that 'the Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured of secure sovereignty; that the other nationalities now under Turkish rule should be assured security of life and autonomous development.' The Delegation submit that any departure from the pledges and principles set forth above would be regarded by the people of India and the Muslim world generally as a breach of faith. It was on the strength of these and similar assurances that tens of thousands of Indian Mussulmans were induced to lay down their lives in the late war in defence of the Allied cause.

Secondly, we have to submit that the most solemn religious obligation of the Muslim faith require that the area known as the Jazirat-ul-Arab or the 'Island of Arabia', which includes, besides, the peninsula of Arabia, Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, shall continue to be, as heretofore for the last thirteen hundred years, under exclusively Muslim control, and that the Khalifa shall similarly continue to be the Warden and Custodian of the Holy Places and Holy Shrines of Islam, namely, Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Najaf, Kerbela, Samarra, Kazimian, and Baghdad, all situated within the Jazirat-ul-Arab. Any encroachment upon these sanctuaries of Islam by the inauguration of non-Muslim control in whatever guise or form, whether a protectorate or Mandate, would be a direct violation of the most binding religious injunctions of Islam and the deepest sentiment of Muslim all the world over, and would, therefore be utterly unacceptable to the Mussulmans of India and the rest of the Indian community. In this connection, apart from the religious obligations to which we refer, the Delegation would draw the attention of the Supreme Council to the Proclamation, issued by the Government of India, on behalf of His Britannic Majesty's Government, as also the Governments of France and Russia on November 2, 1914, in which it was

specifically declared that 'no question of a religious character was involved' in this war and it was further categorically promised 'that the Holy Places of Arabia, including the Holy Shrines of Mesopotamia and the Port of Jedda will be immune from attack or molestation.'

The claims set forth above constitute the irreducible minimum required by the injunctions of the Islamic Faith and the Delegation, as is duty bound, would earnestly impress upon the Supreme Council the fact that any ruthless and unrighteous dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire or any violation of the Holy Land of Islam by the intrusion, in any degree or form, of Christian control in that region, would create a situation fraught with the gravest consequences and reactions for future peace and contentment in the world. What precise form the repercussions may take, it is obviously not possible for the Delegation to forecast. But the Mussulmans of India have already submitted to the British Government that a Turkish Settlement made in disregard of their religious obligations, in respect for which their loyalty has always been strictly conditional, would be regarded by Indian Mussulmans as incompatible with their continued allegience to the British Crown. That is a contingency which the Mussulmans of India, in common with all their compatriots constituting a population of over three hundred millions, naturally view with the keenest apprehension and anxiety, and are most earnestly desirous of preventing by every means in their power. We believe that the British Government, at any rate, are fully apprised of the range and intensity of public feeling that has been aroused in India on this question, and we content ourselves, therefore, by simply stating here that the Khilafat movement represents an unprecedented demonstration of national feeling and concern. Only on the 19th March last, the day when the Delegation was received by the British Empire Minister, all business was suspended throughout the continent of India by Mussulmans and Hindus alike, as a reminder and reaffirmation of the Muslim case in respect of the future of the Khilafat. This unprecedented yet peaceful demonstration involved a loss of millions to the public at large and was undertaken solely with the object of impressing the authorities and others concerned with the universality of Indian and Muslim sentiment on the question. If, notwithstanding all constitutional and loyal representations which the Mussulmans of India have put forward on behalf of the obligations imposed upon them by their faith, a settlement is imposed upon Turkey which would be destructive of the very essential of the Khilafat, a situation would arise in which it would be futile to expect peace and harmony to prevail in India and the Muslim world.

'The Delegation, therefore, feel it their duty most solemnly to urge upon the Supreme Council the desirability of endeavouring to achieve a Peace Settlement with the Ottoman Empire which would be in consonance with the most binding religious obligations and overwhelming sentiments of so large and important a section of the world community. The Delegation would beg even at this late hour, that the Supreme Council may defer taking any final

decisions on this question in order to afford to them an opportunity such as they have repeatedly applied for of laying their submission before the Council. In answer to our request to be allowed to appear before the Supreme Council, the British Secretary to the Council intimated to us that only the accredited Government of the territories with whose future the Peace Conference is dealing are allowed to appear before it, and that at the request of the British Government, the official Delegation of India had already been heard. But as we have already represented that the Turkish Settlement, involving as it does the question of the Khilafat, in the preservation of which the Mussulmans of the world are so vitally interested, does not obviously seem to be a question on which the Peace Conference should hear only the Government of territories with whose future they are dealing. In fact, the concern of the Muslim world for the future of the Khilafat, which is the most essential institution of Islam transcends in importance the interests of the various Governments that are being set up in different parts of the Khilafat territories, and the Delegation trust that no technical objection would be allowed to stand in the way of doing justice and securing peace. A concern that is so vital and affects so large a portion of humanity inhabiting several continents and that arises from a feeling deeper than patriotism and yet not territorial in its essence, cannot, in view of the Delegation, be ignored by the Peace Conference in arranging a settlement of the world's affairs to which it attaches any degree of finality and by means of which it hopes to restore once more the sway of peace over mankind. With reference to the official Delegation of India, which the Supreme Council has already heard, the Indian Khilafat Delegation would invite the attention of the Council to the fact that so far at least, the State and the nation are not one in India, and the Delegation submit that a nation numbering more than 315 millions of people is entitled to a hearing before a final decision is taken on a question that has incontestably acquired a national status. The Delegation hope that they may without any disrespect to the members comprising the official Delegations of India, also refer to the fact that no Indian Mussulman was represented on the Delegation in spite of Muslim protests. Since the Indian Khilafat Delegation are here to urge a full and fair consideration of the religious obligations of the Mussulmans who acknowledge His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey as the Successor of the Prophet and Commander of the Faithful, and have been deputed by the Indian nation to represent its views before the Peace Conference, the Delegation hope that the Supreme Council will enable them to explain these obligations and views. If an opportunity such as they desire is not give them, it is likely to create a sense of injustice in the vast populations that are vitally interested in the success of the mission of peace and reconciliation with which the Delegation have been charged. This will defeat the purpose of the Peace Conference itself which must obviously be to reconcile its decisions to the conscience of mankind.'

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April 1920.

75

SPEECHES OF MOHAMED ALI AND SYED HUSSAIN IN PARIS TO EXPLAIN THE KHILAFAT QUESTION

I have to apologise for not being such a polyglot person as I suppose I ought to be as a member of one of the subject races dominated over by Europe. I have learned the English language besides my own mother tongue and a few other Indian and Oriental languages, but I find that though I am amongst the Allies of England, my English will not carry me very far. Well ladies and gentlemen, we have been deputed by the 70 millions of Mussulmans of India and by the 250 millions of their compatriots of other faiths, who in this matter ardently sympathise with and support them.

On their behalf and on our own I thank you very heartily for the very kind and generous response you have made to our invitation at such very short notice.

France has been noted throughout the world for her widely extended sympathies and her humanity, and in any case it would not have been unnatural for us to expect from France a ready response to the call of righteousness and humanity. But our soldiers who came from India in the hour of your great need, and have now returned home after having shared with you the perils and privations of a devastating war, have carried with them the happiest recollection of your gratitude and of your goodwill, and it is but natural that we should expect from the good people of France consideration and respect for the most binding obligations of our faith and the most cherished sentiments of our nation. France, that has suffered so much in the war and is yet so beset with difficulties to-day in spite of victory, can well sympathise with those hundreds of millions who share our faith or our motherland and are a prey just now to terrible anxieties and corroding cares that deprive them of rest by day and sleep by night.

Ladies and gentlemen ! We are here not to represent Turkey and the Turks, but to represent ourselves and our country, namely India. When the Turks come here they will have their own case to represent to you, but we who have come to-day in your midst do not present the Turkish case but the case of the Mussulmans of India and of all their compatriots who in this matter stand shoulder to shoulder with them. And our case is this : It is not that we have come here to save any territories. It is not that we came here to merely ask you to spare us the one thing which to us is more than all territories, the one thing which is more than all financial resources, and that is the liberty of our conscience. (Cheers). We have come to you, the people of France, to preserve us, and to help us in preserving the sanctity of our souls. (Cheers). This question which has brought us, as I said before, is not merely a Turkish question. It is an Islamic question, an Indian question, an Alge-

rian question, a Tunisian question. It is the question of the preservation of the Khilafat. The Khilafat is the most essential institution of the Muslim community throughout the world. A vast majority of the Muslims of the world recognise the Sultan of Turkey to be the Commander of the Faithful, and the successor and Khalifa of their Prophet. It is an essential part of this doctrine that the Khalifa, the Commander of the Faithful, should have adequate territories, adequate military and naval resources, adequate financial resources. But for what purpose ? Not for aggression, nor even for the defence of Turkey, but for the defence of our Faith. He is to stand before the world as the leader of the Mussulmans in this cause, and whenever the liberty of conscience of the Mussulman in any part of the world is placed in jeopardy, he should at least be able to say to the aggressor, 'You shall not do that with impunity.' (Cheers).

That is the main thesis of our claim. Apart from that is our second claim, namely, that there are certain territories which are the local centres of our faith just as the Khilafat is the personal centre of our faith. They are known to us as Jazirat-ul-Arab, and expression which it may be somewhat difficult for you to understand. 'Jazirah' in the Arbian language means an Island; the sacred region which is the local centre of our faith is and has always been to us an island, though to European geographers Arabia is not an island, a peninsula. When our great Prophet, on whom be peace and God's benediction, was departing from this world, he laid on the Mussulmans of the world an injunction, a great charge, that in this one spot on God's earth, in this sanctuary of our faith, we should not permit any non-Muslim control. The boundaries of Arabia as a peninsula are known to you, but in order to understand how that same Arabia, which is a peninsula to you becomes an island to us, you must understand that while it is bounded on three sides by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, on the fourth side it is bounded by the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. Therefore, in addition to the Peninsula of Arabia, it includes Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine. For more than 1,300 years these have remained in exclusively Muslim control, and we still want exclusive Muslim control there, not because in Mesopotamia we seek oil, as Mr. Lloyd George seeks oil in Mosul, but because we seek there the birthplaces and the graves of the great Prophets of the world. (Loud cheers). For the most part these regions are not properly cultivated, and in places not even cultivable. Before Mr. Lloyd George found oil there they were not very rich in other resources also. But when we first found in our hearts an attachment for them, they were dear to us, not because they were fertile or had rich mineral resources, but because they were the centre, God's kingdom, already come, and a land of the Prophets, and we who consider ourselves not altogether alien to Christians and Jews, we who are the true heirs of Jesus Christ, Moses and Abraham, on all of whom be peace (for we recognise all the Prophets from Adam to Mohamed), we say that we cannot give up the wardenship of this one spot on God's earth without

betraying the great trust that was imposed upon us as His servants and His alone by the Almighty God. (Cheers).

In this region of the Jazirat-ul-Arab are the three great sanctuaries of Islam—Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem. Yes, Jerusalem, as dear to us as it could be to any Christian or Jew. They are all alike held sacred by us and we have always maintained Jerusalem as a sacred trust, not only for Muslims, but also for Jews and Christians, without any disparity and without any difference.

Apart from these three Sacred Harems, we have the Sacred Shrines in Mesopotamia of Najaf, Kerbela, Samarra, Kazimian and Baghdad. All these, according to the Islamic commandments, must always remain in the custody and wardenship of the Khalifa.

This then is our three-fold claim : That the Khilafat shall not be dismembered, but that the Khalifa shall have sufficient temporal power for the Defence of the Faith, that in the Islam land of Arabia there shall be exclusive Muslim control without mandate or protection, and that the Khalifa shall remain as heretofore the Warden of the Holy Places. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will have to acknowledge that we are very modest in our claims. We do say that we want to be masters of the world, as a French journalist tried to make out when discussing our claims with us. We do not want as great power as France, Germany or England, but just power enough to defend our faith and just one bit of territory specially entrusted to our care. The sum total of our claim is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*. But we do not want to rule out political changes which would guarantee not only security of life and property to non-Turkish races, whether Muslim or Christian or Jew, but also opportunities of autonomous development.

We who come from India know how it is possible for a community that is in a minority to have its interests safeguarded, for we ourselves are just such a community.

Having achieved the purpose of the defence and protection of our rights we have fought the battle of Indian freedom by the side of our compatriots, and today the Hindus, Muslims, and Parsees are standing shoulder to shoulder even in this matter, which is a purely religious matter—the question of the Khilafat and of the Holy Places. Therefore we cannot by means desire to rule out autonomous development for the Christians in Armenia, for the Jews in Palestine, for the Arabs there and in Syria and in Mesopotamia. The Arabs are of our faith, are our brethren in faith; we do not by any means rule out opportunities for autonomous development for them, and we who are a subject race ourselves, do not want anyone else to suffer the humiliation of being a subject race without having a voice in the administration of her own affairs.

This is our claim : The War, this most unprecedented of wars—its horrors have been unprecedented, its weapons have been unprecedented, the extent of its slaughter of mankind has been unprecedented -this war is over and has long

been over. After such a war it would have been natural to expect that people would be tired of war. And yet to-day, nearly a year and a half after the Armistice, to-day nearly a year after peace has been concluded with Germany, which was believed to menace Europe and cannot menace anyone today—what do we find ? Peace has not yet resumed her sway over mankind. Peace is not in the hearts of men to-day. And if in the hour of your triumph, a triumph achieved with the assistance of Indian soldiers, of Mussulman soldiers, if today you say to those who were your partners in war, 'You shall not be our partners in peace; you made the war, you saved the war, but to-day you shall not make the peace, today we and we alone shall make the peace, and the kind of peace we like', then, ladies and gentlemen, it is my painful duty to tell you, and I tell you on behalf of over 300 million people, of whose feeling to-day you have no conception, that these people will unite to a man and unite to a woman and will not tolerate such a peace. (Loud cheers).

My friend, Mr. Syed Husain, will explain to you what the situation in India is to-day. When you have heard him you will realise that you have not yet closed the chapter of war, and you cannot say, 'Into this book we will look no more.' On the contrary you will find that the world stands today on a precipice, on the brink of another and perhaps a greater war. In this hour of your triumph you must realise that Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war. You must realise that true religious conviction is a greater thing than material strength. You must realise that it is not sufficient to have large territories as spoils of war; that it is necessary to convince mankind that you respect its religion, and that because you are great and strong you cannot force the conscience of the small and the weak. If you save to us the liberty of our conscience then and then only will you have peace. (Loud and prolonged cheers).

My friend will tell you that if the people who are meeting today at San Remo behind closed doors think that in this way three or four people can gather together and settle the destinies of mankind, they are very much mistaken. People are now determined that they will not tolerate a peace that is entirely against their conscience and entirely against their faith, and that is at variance with the pledges given to them in the name of England, France and Russia; pledges that this war would not involve questions of religious character, that their Holy Places will remain immune from attack or molestation, that the religious obligations of the Muslims should be respected, that the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire will remain Turkish and that for the rest security for life and property would be guaranteed and opportunities of autonomous development would be afforded. If these pledges are not carried out, and if unfortunately anything happens in India, as I am bound to say it is likely to do, it will be very difficult for France or Italy to avoid trouble altogether. Trouble may begin in India, but it will not end in India.

Ladies and gentlemen, you do not know and we cannot forecast today what repercussions it will have in the East. But you who have large commit-

ments in the East, I think it is necessary in your own interests that you should take heed to-day while there is yet time, and we come to you in the friendliest of spirits to give you a friendly warning. Is it not necessary and proper that one friend should come to another in such grave contingencies as are in view and give a friendly warning of the danger ahead? We hope that in your Government, and to save another war, for which not even Europe is prepared to-day.

But more than this; as friends of England we hope that you will use your privilege as a friend to warn England also and advise her and tell her that she is facing a real and not a fancied danger.

It was a Frenchman, I believe, who wrote that man was born free and everywhere he is in chains. And if mankind is to-day in chains, it will be, I hope, a Frenchman who will break those chains.

There was a time when the French went out to the East in the hope of conquering India. But it was destined for another Power to conquer India, if India can be said to have been really conquered. But to-day you have an opportunity of conquering not the land but the hearts of India, and

I say to you, 'Vive la France.'

Mr. Syed Husain next spoke thus :

I should also like to begin by apologising to you very sincerely for having to inflict my few remarks on you, in a language which is, I am afraid, as foreign to me as to you, but these are the exigencies of our present-day International complications, and I hope you will bear with me for that reason.

My friend and colleague, Mr. Mohamed Ali, has already explained to you the solemn and absolutely inalienable religious obligations of the vast community of Mussulmans not only in India but in the world at large with regard to the Kaliphate.

There are just one or two things which I would like to present to you as clearly and briefly as I can.

The first thing, ladies and gentlemen, that we would put before you is this : That it is not merely the Mussulmans of India but the Muslims of the world who are interested in maintaining the Institution of the Kaliphate. If Islam is to exist in the world, then it is absolutely essential that Islam should have a Kaliphate. That has been the history and tradition of Islam ever since its foundation fourteen hundred years ago, and so far as the Muslim world is concerned, you may take it from me, ladies and gentlemen, that the Muslims are not prepared to let the Kaliphate perish from this world.

In regard to our actual credentials I will say this to you :

I will ask you for one moment to visualise a population united with the same culture, the same antecedents, the same historic traditions and the same religious obligations a community of 75 millions of people solidly and solemnly united on this question. That is the constituency that we directly represent and which has elected us to come out to you on this mission. You compare this figure with your own population, with the population of Great Britain, or with that of any other European nation, and you will then perhaps realise the numerical strength of the people we represent, whose religious convictions we have come to put before you.

But ladies and gentlemen, it is not merely the 75 millions of the population of India who owe allegiance to the Muslim Faith, who are concerned in this matter. The population of India is 315 millions and the vast non-Muslim element of the population is absolutely identified with its Muslim compatriots on this question. (Cheers). Now you can very well ask what interest the non-Muslims of India have in a question that is admittedly a religious question affecting the Muslims and no others. My answer to that is that during the last few years, especially during the last year or so, during the period of the war, the Indian national movement of which some of you may have heard, has been gaining strength and gathering volume with a rapidity of which you can have no conception Even five years ago it might have been said with some truth that there was not one India but several Indias. But to-day, ladies and gentlemen, you may take it from me that there is one solid, united, nationalist India, a nationalist community which wants freedom for a united India. And our Hindu, Parsee, Sikh, Christian, Jewish, and other fellow compatriots of India are identified with us in this Muslim movement of the Kaliphate, because they have come to realise, and it is a very enlightened and truly democratic and progressive conviction, that the principle of Indian national unity demands that the most solemn religious obligations and sentiments of 75 millions of the Indian people shall not be allowed to be trampled underfoot. It is for this reason that the Hindus are to-day standing shoulder to shoulder with us. It is an authentic and inspiring conception of true Indian nationalism that has brought the whole of India together on the issue of the Kaliphate. (Cheers).

So much, ladies and gentlemen, for the genesis of this Indian movement, and it is for the reason I have mentioned that we claim, as we informed the British Prime Minister in a recent interview which our deputation had with him, that this question of the Kaliphate is not only a Muslim question. It has acquired the status of an Indian national question, because the solid united Indian nation is standing behind this movement, and, ladies and gentlemen, what do we ask for ? As those of you who are at all in touch with affairs in the East know, we are not famous for our enterprise in any direction; we are not Imperialists; we are not concession-hunter; we are not exploiters; we are not seeking to go into other people's territories and exploit them for our own benefit. We do not even wish to say for other people how they shall self-

determine. (Laughter). All we ask is to be let alone in respect of our spiritual and cultural existence. You know there are not many fragments of the world's furface now left outside Europe which are not to-day under one form or another of European domination. But we do say this that the Holy Land of Islam which contains all the Holy Places and Shrines of Islam, hallowed by the memories of fourteen hundred years of Islamic history shall not pass from Muslim hands. We draw the line at that. We say, you have exploited the universe, but you will not violate these sanctuaries : leave these Shrines and these Holy Places alone, because they are vital to us in a sense of which you can have no conception, dearer than anything else in life, and indispensable to our religious and communal existence.

It is not a political claim; it is not a territorial claim, it is not a claim of aggressive nationalism. It is a claim for liberty of conscience, for the rights of faith which are inalienable. I hope you will agree with me that there is nothing irrational or unnecessarily aggressive or excessive in that.

That is our case -that the Kaliphate shall not pass from the world, that the Holy Land of Islam shall continue to remain inviolate as during the last fourteen hundred years. It is a case which obviously and frankly we have put before you from the religious point of view in the name of the liberty of human conscience. But look at it from your own point of view. Supposing that you (and by you I mean the Allied Powers) supposing that you have got the means, power and strength to impose upon us an unrighteous peace. Supposing you can do so, in fact. Well, is that likely to bring into the world that peace and harmony, and that universal contentment which I believe all the civilised peoples of the world today are longing for ? Is that the way to build up and enduring peace hereafter ? Are you going to achieve tranquillity by trampling underfoot the most solemn religious convictions and cultural requirements of seventy-five millions of people, and the national sentiment of one-fifth of the world's population ? In fact, as you know, it is even a larger issue in all its ramifications, but we confine ourselves to speaking for our own constituency, which is the people of India. (Cheers). What kind of a peace are you going to have ? It will not be peace so far as you are concerned, or so far as our people are concerned, those millions who owe allegiance to the Islamic faith, and who shall be bound in conscience not to accept, but to resist, to reject it as far as it lies in our power. Where then does world-peace come in ? Surely it is not right, looking at it from any conceivable point of view, rational or moral, and taking a long view of things, that the world should be precipitated into so momentous and gratuitous a cataclysm. (Cheers).

Those of you have any voice or influence in the shaping of the peace, it is your duty to understand the point of view of those whose rights of liberty of conscience are assailed and threatened at the present moment, and so far as that goes, it stands to reason you can judge for yourselves whether it is not preposterous that men, I do not care how great men they may be - two or

three, or half a dozen men, should have it in their power to sit down behind closed doors and dispose, not only of the territorial but also the spiritual destinies of a vast portion of the population of the world.

It is a complicated question; it is a question which you will only understand if you bring to its consideration a large measure of sympathy, insight and tolerance for other people's views and sentiments. Those views and sentiments may not be yours, but you must recognise as a fact that they represent the convictions of a large section of the world community, and as such are entitled to be treated with respect and consideration.

Those who are statesmen and those who have taken upon themselves to settle the destinies of the world and the foundation of a lasting peace, it is surely their duty to see that the sentiments of so many millions of human beings, of those who have been your friends and Allies, shall not be violated. Tens of thousands of my fellow-countrymen, of my co-religionists, came and shed their lives on the battle-fields of France, Flanders, Mesopotamia, Egypt and Palestine, in defence of the cause of Freedom as they believed the Allied cause to be. Are you going to tell us to-day, now that the war is over—those among you who are politicians and statesmen, you who know the solemn pledges that were given to our people by the British Government in the name of the Governments, of France and the other Allies—are you going to tell us that you are going to be false to those pledges and promises, and, if so, do you think you are going to have peace in the world ? This is a question, ladies and gentlemen, which does not require any answer. (Cheers).

We have come to you on a mission of peace. We have no aggressive designs against anybody. We come to you with a message of reconciliation, and to help you to understand our point of view and build up a lasting understanding between all the Allies and Islam, between England and France and Islam, because France has got large Muslim obligations, and if France allows herself to be a party to the kind of inequity that we fear is contemplated, then it is idle to expect that she will not be involved in all the repercussions that must follow upon a grave outrage on the religious sentiments of the Islamic world.

Therefore, I have only this is to say in conclusion, that, whatever else you may believe in or not, you may take it that if the Khaliphate is dismembered, and the sanctity of the Holy Places of Islam violated, the world will be plunged in a grave and incalculable ferment. So far as we are concerned, we have already intimated to our Government that, if they are to be a party to the negation of the cardinal obligations of the Islamic Faith, then Muslims will have no option but to consider themselves absolved from the loyalty and allegiance they owe to the British Crown.

What is the situation in India to-day ? Do you know that on March 19 last—a matter of a few weeks ago—we had in India a complete cessation of all business—what you might have in Europe, supposing it were possible to have a universal strike from one end of the continent to the other; not

merely a railway strike or a postal or tramway strike, but a universal cessation of all business and all forms of activity. That is what we had on March 19 in India, and its sole object was to impress upon our Government, as upon the world, that India is united and in deadly earnest in respect of this demand on behalf of the preservation of the Kaliphate. Just think what it meant : As you know, some of you, India is as big a country as Europe minus Russia, and from one end to the other of India not only Mussulmans, but the whole population, stopped work for one day as a peaceful demonstration on behalf of the Kaliphate. Our people to-day are a very poor people, and it involved them in a loss of millions, but they cheerfully bore that sacrifice, as they are willing to bear many other sacrifices, in order to proclaim that, whatever else they may have lost, they do not propose to let the last symbol of Islamic power and existence pass away from the world unchallenged and unmourned. That we are prepared to prevent as far as it lies in our irreducible minimum before the British Government and we have come here to do the same in France.

You know very well that throughout the East the name of France is synonymous with respect for liberty of conscience not only yours and mine, but universal conscience. I mention that as fact, not as a compliment.

Take it from me, ladies and gentlemen, that if France is going to be a party to the violation of our conscience, France will be equally a party to a general demoralisation of the world-conscience, and France should not go back upon her great traditions. (Cheers).

Source : The Muslim Outlook, April, 1920.

76

SPEECH OF MOHAMMAD ALI AT THE KINGSWAY HALL MEETING

The resolution that I have the honour to place before you this evening is :

That this meeting urges upon the Government the necessity for taking into serious consideration, in the Turkish settlement, the religious obligations of the Mussulmans (who in India alone number some 70 million citizens of the British Empire) and the national sentiment of United India.

Before I say anything about the claims that we have come to present, not only to the British and Allied Governments, but to the nations of Europe and America, I should like to make one point clear. And it is this—that we are not Turks. Whether the Turks be good people or bad people, whether they are gentle and humane, as all who have known them say, or murderers

of women and children and massacrers, as has been alleged fairly frequently, they are, technically at any rate, the King's enemies. But we are British Indians, fellow-citizens of yours and as good subjects as you are of the King-Emperor. When the Turks come they will present a case to the Allies. I hope they will present the case well, and I hope they will succeed in presenting their case. But the case we have got to present is not the case of aliens or enemies, but the case of members of this Empire. I am glad that in the resolution the word 'citizens' is used. To tell you the truth, I have been quite content to call myself a subject (Mr. Lansbury and the audience: 'No a citizen'). However, I present the case to-day from the eminence of British citizenship, which I can only feel just a little bit when I am here and not at all in my own country, where I can be interned or imprisoned without charge or trial, and where it is rather difficult for me to remember that I am as much a citizen as Mr. Lansbury. (Laughter and cheers). For if he is sent to prison, for which, I am sure he has qualified himself- (Loud laughter) – the people would soon know the reason why by a few questions asked in the House of Commons - one of our friends here (Colonel Wedgwood) would probably have an all-night sitting—and even if the House of Commons proved as impotent as it sometimes is in these democratic days of Coalitions and Coupons—(Laughter)—the good people of the Labour Party would see to it that by some sort of action, direct or indirect, I can't tell which—(Laughter)—the right of British Citizenship was not denied Mr. Lensbury.

Now, what is our case ? We are told in the '*Times*' and other newspapers that the Muslims of India must not dictate the foreign policy of the British Government. Well, ladies and gentlemen, our wildest dreams it certainly did not occur to us to dictate the foreign policy of British Government. I wish we could even dictate the internal policy of the Government in connection with India. (Laughter). If this is an Empire (I should like to call it a Commonwealth) in which we are equal partners, as we are very often told we are, and it was certainly demanded of us to be equal partners when sacrifices had got to be made—and at that time we in India neither stinted money nor men—well, then, when the war is over, when the captains and the kings have departed—particularly the kings, for only one or two are now left (Laughter)—when poor, common people, no better than us Indians and people of that sort, very common people, not autocrats and aristocrats, but mere democrats, have assembled to make peace—(Laughter)—than I want to know what position I, whose people have given their men and money, have in the making of the peace. (Cheers). If you, ladies and gentlemen, who are of British birth and Christian Faith, do not like your policy to be dictated to you by black heathens of the East, then I say we also do not want the foreign policy of our Empire to be dictated to us by a tiny fraction of forty-five millions of people of British birth and Christian Faith. (Cheers).

If you desire to have a Commonwealth, well and good. If you want the old-fashioned Empire, well and good, though not so well and good; but in

any case it is not Little Englanders who call themselves Imperialists that are going to lay down the policy of the British Empire. (Cheers). We, who number three hundred and fifteen millions, should, I say, have some kind of voice, if not the prepondering voice, in the making of peace, though we had none in the making of a war which, nevertheless, we were called upon to wage. (Cheers).

Apart from that consideration there is another. In this it is not a question of citizenship, but purely a question of subjection, but of a subjection that is and has always been strictly conditional. When the Queen of England, in the days of my grandfather, took into her hands the reins of office in India, and began to rule over the territories of the East India Company, a trading company which had become a sovereign power entirely against its will, after passing numerous self-denying ordinance—(Laughter)—well, when the reins of Government in these territories passed into the hands of the Queen, a proclamation was issued that did her credit and did your people credit. It was a noble one and we have always believed in it. The most important thing that the document contained was that no matter what change should take place, one thing would remain unchanged—our religious obligations would be respected. Ladies and gentlemen, we have given you whatever you needed, we were certainly not 'picy' and never stinted money. In fact we have been spend thrifts perhaps, and squandered what wealth was left to us after having squandered away an Empire; but whatever we may or may not have thrown away, one thing was dear to us and that was faith (Cheers) and it was understood that it was to be in all circumstances respected by the British. You may have had your Catholic disabilities and your Jewish disabilities. But we were assured that within the Indian Empire you had removed the disabilities of the Indians. They could claim to have free consciences, and it was clearly on the basis that our faith would be entirely respected that we consented to accept the rule of the Queen.

It may have been that we were too powerless at the time to have stopped you from exercising religious tyranny over the country, you with your powerful guns, ships and weapons of destruction; it may have been that we would have been entirely our faith; but whatever the situation, it is a fact that in the name of Great Britain the Queen gave us the charter of our religious liberties, and gave us the pledge that our religious obligations would be entirely respected. That was the price of our allegiance to the Queen of Great Britain. Today, when the Muslims are called upon to disregard their religious obligations, it is clearly because of that charter that Indians have a right to say 'this shall not be.' (Cheers). They will have to go, not only to His Majesty, the successor of Queen Victoria, not only to 10, Downing Street, where Mr. Lloyd George now lives, and hopes to live for ever and ever, they will have to go to every British man and woman who has drawn the least benefit from British rule over India, and tell them that they cannot possibly

ask them to disregard their religious obligations without the most palpable breach of faith with more than three hundred millions of people. (Loud cheers).

If the religious claims of the Indian Mussulmans, which were to them solemn obligations, were now to be ignored, the pledge contained in the noble Proclamation of 1858 would be broken. You may, if you choose, question our claims and examine whether the preservation of the Khilafat, with adequate temporal power for the defence of the faith, and the maintenance of exclusive Muslim control over Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, are duties imposed by Islam on every Muslim or not. But once they are acknowledged to be so, as they must be, then you cannot thereafter say we must dismember the Khilafat and demand a mandate in Mesopotamia and still expect from us the same loyal allegiance. This cannot and shall not be. (Cheers).

In the House of Commons the hero of Paisley, fresh from his triumph, in the very first debate that he could start on the subject after his election, liked of the connection of the Khilafat and Constantinople as being a fairly modern matter, and maintained that the Sultan as Khalifa has not been there more than four hundred years. Well, that is still 300 years longer than the rule of English kings and queens in India, but I will come to that by and by. Well, Mr. Asquith wanted to 'Vaticanise' the Khalifa. But the Khalifa, as even Mr. Lloyd George could now tell him, was not the Pope, and the moment he would consent to be 'Vaticanised', he would cease to be the Khalifa. He was the Commander of the Faithful, the President of our Theocratic Commonwealth, the Leader of all Mussulmans in peace and war, though he could neither claim to be infallible like the Pope, nor could he in all circumstances exercise unquestioned authority, for Allah was the only Sovereign, and in case of dispute Mussulmans were bound to refer back to the Holy Quran and to the Traditions of the Prophet whose successor the Khalifa is.

But whatever he could or could not do, the Khalifa was certainly not a pious old gentleman, whose only function in life was to mumble his prayers and repeat his beads as Mr. Asquith clearly seems to think. If such is the ignorance of Mr. Asquith with regard to such fundamental doctrinces of Islam, even after having been enlightened by our Delegation, then is it not a shame and a disgrace to one who has once been, and apparently still dreams of being once more, the Prime Minister of the Imperial Government of Great Britain ? (Laughter).

Having claimed to shape the destinies of three or four hundred million Indians, including over 70 millions, if this is the extent of their knowledge, then I say it is a shame and a disgrace. (Cheers). Mr. Asquith said, no doubt humorously, that in these days even if a Khalifa goes to war he cannot hope to go to war with limited liabilities. Well, I will say this to him, that even in this twentieth century we are a very backward people in India, and if you will go to war with the Khalifa in order to oust him from the seat of the Khilafat, if you go to war with him in order to dismember his Empire, and if

you go to war with him in order to step into the sancturies of our faith, because there is oil in Mosul, if you go to war with him because the sanctity of the Holy Land of Islam must be violated by exploiters demanding a mandate in Mesopotamia, no doubt in the Sacred name of Self-Determination spelt with three letters, O-I-L—(Laughter)-then even in these days you will have to go to war, I am afraid, with very limited assets indeed. (Loud cheers).

It is sometimes said, 'The Turks waged war against us; we fought them and we have defeated them, now we are going to treat them as defeated people. We have beaten the Turks and must deal with them as we wish.' This argument is all very fine, but who is 'We' who fought, and who won the war? Who went to war in Mesopotamia? Who went to war in the Holy Land? India won Baghdad, and India and Muslims won the Holy Land. According to Mr. Lloyd George, the Allies are not dealing with the Turks differently from other defeated people. We are told there is nothing of the Christian and the Crusading spirit in this matter. And yet, when proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby he said: 'The name of General Allenby will be ever renowned as that of the brilliant Commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the crusades. It was his good fortune by his skill to bring to a glorious and an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose in vain, and a British Army under the command of General Allenby achieved it finally.' So there was after all somethingof the crusading spirit somewhere when General Allenby, in the words of Mr. Lloyd George himself, 'won the last and most triumphant of the crusades'. However, at the very time Lord Allenby was saying that two-thirds of his army in this crusade was composed of Muslims; a wonderful crusade, in which the Crescent was fighting the battle of the Cross. But, anyhow, were not the co-religionists and compatriots of these strange Crusaders who repudiated the Cross and yet fought the Crescent, entitled to demand that the religious obligations of the Mussulmans and the overwhelming national sentiments of India should be considered in the Turkish settlement?

Whatever the Indian soldiers have done, this I will say about them—I have seen them; we had always avoided contact with them in deference to official susceptibilities—but when we came out of gaol these people have rushed to us like the rest of their countrymen, they have kissed our hands, embraced us, shown to us in an unmistakable manner that if you demanded from them, conscripted soldiers as they almost were, that they should go against their own religious obligations, they have unmistakably shown to us that that day you will be using a weapon which will break in your hands. (Cheers).

Therefore, although I do not threaten, although we have not come here to threaten you, it ought to be made clear to you that the situation is now different. To-day it is not only the Muslims who feel like this, but the Hindu and even the Sikhs—after Amritsar. (Cheers.) India to-day is one and united. (Cheers.) That is why in our resolution we have asked the Government to

show respect not only for Muslim obligations, but also for the national sentiment of United India. How is this sentiment expressing itself? On the 17th October last the Muslims observed the Khilafat Day, a day on which the Mussulmans suspended business and fasted and prayed, and many Hindus joined them. Now on the 19th March, precisely the day that we were being received in 10, Downing Street by Mr. Lloyd George, from one end of the India to another there was a total suspension of business, in which not only Mussulmans and Hindus and Sikhs, but Parsees and others also participated. In order to realise what this suspension of business means, I will ask you not to think of a railway strike. nor even a general strike in England or in Germany; you have got to think of the total suspension business of throughout the Continent of Europe. (Cheers). Yet, primitive as some of our people are, very impulsive as they seem to be, in spite of this universal demonstration, there was no violence. (Cheers). And this in spite of the existence of men who provoke violence. Yes, there is a class of people that exerts violence. We have known people in India who are agents of violence, because if violence is provoked, in its early stages it might be crushed, and that might be used as an argument for 'not making concessions to rebels.' That is the old vicious circle in which people who want to keep power in their own hands try that the world should move. Oppression provokes disturbances and disturbances are used for perpetuating oppression and refusing reforms. After reading a good deal of the history of England at Oxford, I am not quite sure that three-quarters of your constitution is not based on force or a show of force in the background. When King John gave the Magna Charta to the people of England, the great charter of your liberties, and I hope of ours too, in spite of some recent decisions of the Privy Council—(Cheers)—he did not do it absolutely out of love for the British people. (Laughter). Still less, when King Charles forfeited his head, he did not sign his death-warrant because he thought the best thing for him to do was to leave the world. (Laughter). The same sort of thing may be said of the conditions which prevailed in the days of King Charles, the Second, who did not want to go on his travels again, and of James, the Second, who did apparently want to go. (Laughter). In all these reforms, one after another, you always find this that the people's liberties had to be either purchased when kings were in need of money for their wars or their armours—(Laughter)—or there was force, or a show of force, in the background. We in India, however, do not threaten you with force.

We are being led by a man who believes in Soul-force. If throughout the world today there is anyone who tries to live up to the Sermon on the Mount—that Sermon which is often overrated but at the same time always forgotten in the shaping of your foreign policy—if any man tries to live up to that Sermon it is Mahatma Gandhi. (Loud cheers). He is not a Muslim. He is a Hindu of Hindus. Today he is leading the entire continent of India because he has realised that in this matter the Mussulmans are not carrying on a 'fictitious' and a 'factitious' agitation, and he has carefully ascertained

that they cannot possibly 'moderate' the claims that they have put forward being absolutely false to all the convictions that they have charished for centuries. Time after time he had pressed us for irreducible minimum of our claims. He has at last himself drawn up a manifesto, which we have brought with us as the mandate of the Indian Delegation. The claim put forward is a simple claim. It says that it is one of the fundamental doctrines of Islam, absolutely unhearable, that there should always be a Khalifa, and that the Khalifa should have temporal power at all times adequate for the defence of the Faith, and that is the measure of the irreducible minimum of temporal power.

Whatever you like to think about temporal power, I am convinced, and I think I can convince you easily enough, that when you have people like Lord Bryce who want to use the argument of the 'Big Stick', you will be bound to meet the Muslims demand for temporal power for the Khalifa. (Cheers). If, however, there is complete disarmament in Europe, the first person who will desire to bring his arms to the scrap-heap, or to turn them, into ploughshares, will be the Muslim Khalifa himself. (Lound cheers).

The second claim is that the local centre of our Faith, the land known as the Island of Arabia, should be free from non-Islamic control in any shape or form. Arabia to the European geographer is a peninsula bounded only on three sides by water; but to the Islamic religion it has always been an Island. You will understand this when I tell you that it is surrounded on one side by the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, on another side by the Indian Ocean, on the third side by the Persian Gulf, and on the fourth by the waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris; and on his deathbed our Prophet gave an injunction, binding on all sections of Muslims, that in that region no kind of non-Muslim control should be allowed.

But even if you disregard our religious requirements, what about your own political principles ? We have heard a great deal of the principle of self-determination, and now that we have seen some applications of this principle, we find that it has about as many interpretations as love or religion. (Laughter). There is one interpretation when the principle is applied to Ireland; on this you are all well-informed, and I shall not waste your time. There is another interpretation of self-determination for Montenegro, when it is assured it is not good to be a cock's head when you can be a bull's tail. (Laughter). In spite of Montenegro's desire for independence, she is assured that it is better in her own interest to be part of a larger unit. When we ask that the Arabs should not be forced to get out of the larger unit we are told by Mr. Lloyd George : 'Is the sacred principle of self-determination not to be applied to an Arab simply because he is a Mussulman ?' But surely the last interpretation of self-determination is the best of all. We never knew that that large mouthful of a word, self-determination could be spelt with three letters : O-I-L. (Laughter). This is the latest interpretation of self-determination. But whatever Mr. Lloyd George may say, the people of Mesopotamia,

as well as those of Syria and Palestine, have clearly determined that they will have no mandates and no protectorates. (Cheers).

Then we come to Constantinople, which has been very generously spared to the Khalifa, out of defenee to Muslim wishes or to French wishes, I cannot tell which. (Laughter).

But did not Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, and Sir Edward Carson tell us that this had to be since there was no other alternative, and the late lamented and always lamentable Tsarist autocracy was no more ? (Laughter). And is it the Khalifa in chancery ? The Khalifa is to remain a hostage in the hands of the Powers, and we are to express our gratitude for it. This is an outrage which Islam will never tolerate. (Cheers). The Straits are to be taken out of Turkish control, and British guns are always to be trained on the Khalifa's palace. There was a time when Great Britain and France went to war with Russia on the side of Turkey, because Russia wanted the Straits to be open to her battle fleet. Today there is no Russian battle-fleet, so you find that the Straits are to be opened and to be guarded by Russia's recent Allies, because the Turks 'must not be able to slam the door in our face'. Why should they not ? Do you not slam the door in the face of all comers in the harbour of Dover ? The present demand is just as though you were going to be asked to open the Yarmouth harbour to the German ship. What is going to happen is this; that the Straits of Dardenelles and Bosphorus will once more be closed to Russia, but this time by her Allies the British. The whole past history of this Straits business been this; the Russian Black Sea fleet wanted to come out into the Mediterranean, and the Turks were asked to keep the door slammed in everybody's face, because the route to India should not be endangered. Today it is not the Russian Black Sea fleet that wants to come out into the Mediterranean—it is the fleet of another Power that wants to get into the Black Sea to outflank Soviet Russia and to control the oil that comes from Baku to Batoum. Numerous little States, such as Azarbaijan, formerly parts of the Russian Empire have been formed now, to guard for the Allied Power the oil at Baku. Whether it is oil, whether it is Bolshevism, that suggests this policy—whatever it is, the Muslims cannot permit that their Khalifa is to remain as a hostage. They claim that it is part of their Faith that the Khilafat should exist as an independent sovereignty, and its Empire should not be dismembered any further after the very great spoliation that had already taken place after the Balkan War. After that large spoliation the Khalifa's Empire has really been reduced to such small proportions that they cannot allow the least little bit of Khilafat territory to be taken away from the Khalifa, and they must insist that in the Holy Lands, even in spite of oil, they would not have a British Protectorate, or French or American mandate.

They do not rule out political changes, and they say that if the Arabs genuinely desire Self-Government they should have it. If the Jews desire it they should have it. If the claim of the Jews is not for political sovereignty,

but for economic freedom or for a cultural federation, it can be gladly recognised. Lastly, if the Armenians in so-called Armenia want self-government they should have Self-Government; but they should not, being in a minority, be allowed to rule over the Muslim majority.

People in this country talk so much of the Armenian 'massacres'. I crossed over to France the other day, and although I talked with various classes of people, they never once mentioned to me those blessed words 'Armenian massacres'. It seems to me that the only people in love with the massacres are the British. (Laughter). What do we ask ? I do not treat the matter lightly. It is not a matter for jokes. (Cheers). A massacre is a massacre and whoever indulges in it is a criminal, and a criminal should be punished. (Cheers). We, the Muslims of India, do not care this much for the Turkish Empire, as such. We care for Islam. (Cheers). If the name of Islam is to be besmirched in this manner, then we want you to go to the spot and hold a careful enquiry. Mr. Lloyd George was asked to publish the Inter-Allied Commission's report about the massacres undoubtedly indulged in by Greek soldiers in Smyrna. They had no right to be there. Yet in the name of yourself and your Allies these peoples went there, according to the report of this Inter-Allied Commission, in the spirit of conquerors and crusaders, perpetrated massacres and outrages of every sort. Nothing was published because Mr. Lloyd George said that the Greeks had not been heard in their defence, and even a Christian should not be punished before he is tried and found guilty. I do not know why he used that word 'even', but I can equally well say even a Muslim should be tried before he is punished. (Cheers). There have been allegations against the Turks for a long time because the Czars of Russia were anxious to make a corridor through Europe and Asia from Petrograd to Peshawar (Cheers), and after the success of this massacre 'stunt' in the Balkans and the liberation of Bulgaria, they tried the same sort of intrigue in Armenia. Nothing pleased the Russian so much as a massacre. Russia has gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies (Cheers), but it has left this legacy of massacres behind. (Cheers)

What do Muslims ask ? They say : 'Have an International Commission : Allow the Muslims of India and Hindus to be represented on that Commission, and go into the whole question of massacres before the war, during the war, and now. If the Turks are found guilty they should be punished. But if they are to be punished, equal punishment should be metep out to those who caused the sands of Tripoli to be soaked with Arab blood.' (Cheers) We demand that in the Balkans—the bones of Turks are still bleaching today on Balkan heights (Cheers)—we demand that the people who butchered women and children there in cold blood after unnameable outrages, should be punished. And we Indians have a right to demand that not only should it be the Italians and the Bulgarians and the Greeks, but even the British the O'Dwyers and the Dyers who have dyed their hands with gore (shame) and fired on innocent crowds assembled for lawful purpose (shame) on April 23

last year, we demand that they too should be punished.

But, if you, English men and women, are not prepared to do justice by your own people, then I say you have no right to talk of doing justice by the Turks, and to deal with this business of massacres. If you will use force to compel us to submit to a peace that contravenes Islamic religious requirements, and blood is shed for blood, then the guilt of blood will be yours, because you are prepared to use force, but you are not prepared to do justice to the Muslims. (Cheers).

This is what we have come to ask. I tell you this, we have not come to threaten, and we do not threaten you. My friend Mr. Wedgwood, in the House of Commons, said, 'you can get more out of English people by persuasion than by threats', and I believe him. But he says, 'what can you threaten us with ?' Well, that is the worst part of the whole business. (Cheers). There is nothing at all after less than a hundred years of British rule that we can threaten you with. (Cheers). It is true, as Colonel Wedgwood asked, what can we threaten you with ? Though the measure of our impotence, in spite of our righteous wrath today, is also the measure of the success of your crushing rule achieved in no more than a century. (Cheers). But having reduced us to this state of impotence, I ask you to consider this. If we want to threaten you, we obviously cannot threaten you with Howitzers and Dreadnoughts and aeroplanes and Tanks; but we possess a thing that is unconquerable : our determination to die true to our Faith. (Cheers). Money is being poured into the Fund for the Khilafat. But every Muslim who pays is told that this is not money; it is only draft on the life of every subscriber. (Cheers). We do not threaten to kill you; but we do threaten you with our undying determination to die kings of our consciences and masters of our souls. (Cheers).

Source : The Muslim Outlook, May, 1920.

77

INDIAN MUSLIMS' MESSAGE TO KHALIFA

13 May 1920

To His Imperial Majesty Sultan Waheedudden Muhammad, Khalifat-ur-Rassol, Ameer-ul-Mu'mineen, Khadim-ul-Haramain-ish-Sharafain, Constantinople.

With the name of Allah, the most Merciful, and the most Compassionate.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation, representing over seventy million Mussulmans and 250 millions of their compatriots of other creeds who stand

shoulder to shoulder with them, have been delegated to explain to the Allied Powers and the Peace Conference the religious obligations imposed on every Muslim by his faith and to express the overwhelming national sentiment of India with regard to the preservation of the Khilafat and the inviolability of the sanctuaries of Islam.

The Delegation beg to offer in the name of their co-religionists, at this grave crisis in the history of Islam and of the Khilafat, their whole-hearted allegiance to your Majesty as the Successor of their Prophet and the Commander of the Faithful.

Although deeply ashamed that the Mussulmans permitted the Khilafat, however unwillingly it be, to be reduced to its present distressing condition, we nevertheless venture, with all the profound esteem that we entertain for your Majesty and the great veneration inseparable from your high office, to submit that to-day the eyes of Mussulmans throughout the world are turned towards Istambol, and they confidently trust that, in all conceivable circumstances and at all costs, your Majesty will uphold the dignity of Islam and will remain steadfast in the defence of the Khilafat and the sanctity of the Jazirat-ul-Arab in its entirety.

We were charged to claim for the Khilafat the complete restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum* without prejudice to such political changes as guaranteed to non-Turkish nationalities, if they so desired, autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire consistently with the digional of a Sovereign State, and were to explain that this was the irreducible minimum of temporal power inalienable from the sacred institution of the Khilafat that could be considered adequate for the defence of our Faith. We were also charged to declare that the Khalifa alone could be the servant of the three sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem and the Warden of the Holy Shrines, and further that no Mussulman would, or could, tolerate any form of non-Muslim control, whether in the shape of mandates or otherwise, over Syria, Palestine, or Mesopotamia, included as they are in the sacred soil of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, that had been entrusted, on his deathbed, by our Holy Prophet to our sole care.

We have tried to explain our three-fold claim to the Allies to the best of our limited powers, and in spite of the appalling ignorance and tragic indifference, even of some of those who are making themselves responsible for a new settlement of the world's affairs, we have made it sufficiently clear and emphasised that the reduction of the Muslim claim, by a hair's breadth, will not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Muslims, but will also be a flagrant violation of the solemn pledges given by responsible statesmen representing the Allied and Associated Powers and given at a time when they were desirous of enlisting the support of the Muslim people and soldiery.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, May, 1920.

INDEX